Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-90-113
Tuesday
12 June 1990

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-90-113 *12 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ALBANIA

Police Said to Beat Up French Ambassador, Wife *[Hamburg BILD 12 Jun]* 1
Central Bank Wants Back in BIS as Shareholder *[AFP]* 1
Tirana Cited on Building of Nuclear Reactor *[Belgrade BORBA 6 Jun]* 1
State Viewed in Light of E. European 'Upheavals' *[ZERI I POPULLIT 29 May]* 1
Parliamentary Election Results, Reactions Noted 3
Official Results Postponed *[Sofia Radio]* 3
More Results Announced *[Sofia Radio]* 3
42% of Candidates Lack Majority *[BTA]*
'Convincing SDS Victory' in Sofia *[Sofia Radio]* 4
BSP Leaders Defeated in Sofia *[BTA]* 5
Winners, Losers Named *[BTA]* 5
SDS Says No Coalition With BSP *[Sofia Radio]* 5
SDS Holds News Conference *[BTA]* 6
BSDP Leader Against Joining Coalition *[BTA]* 6
Agrarians To Back SDS in 2d Round *[BTA]* 7
BZNS Assesses Results *[Sofia Radio]* 7
Demonstrations at Sofia SDS Rally, Elsewhere 7
Militia on 'Tension' in Sofia *[Sofia Radio]* 7
Demonstrators: Election 'Rigged' *[AFP]* 8
SDS Denies Organizing Protest *[BTA]* 8
Militia Appeals for Calm *[Sofia Radio]* 9
Zhelev, Dertliev Address Rally *[Sofia Radio]* 9
More on Leaders' Statements *[BTA]* 9
Situation Said 'Serious' *[Sofia Radio]* 9
Rural Protests Noted *[BTA]* 10
Demonstrators Interviewed *[Sofia Radio]* 10
Minister Meets Students; No Results *[Sofia Radio]* 11
Mladenov Announcement on Need for Tolerance *[Sofia Radio]* 11
Lukanov Issues Statement on Elections *[Sofia Radio]* 12
Election Commission, Observers Comment 12
Results Seen as Open *[BTA]* 12
Commission Reviews Complaints *[Sofia Radio]* 13
Election Council's Sendov Remarks *[BTA]* 13
Pazardzhik Violations Confirmed *[Sofia Radio]* 14
Observer: Vote 'Correct,' 'Impressive' *[Vienna Radio]* 14
Observers on 'Normal Course' *[BTA]* 14
Istanbul Says 17 Ethic Turks Elected *[AFP]* 15

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Havel, Parties Agree To Name Calfa Premier *[Prague Radio]* 16
Calfa Says Some Government Tasks Fulfilled *[CTK]* 16
Communist Leaders View Future Role *[Prague TV]* 16
CSL Official Assaulted; Complaint Lodged *[LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE 1 Jun]* 16
Finance Minister Outlines Planned Reforms *[Prague Radio]* 17
Allegations Against People's Party's Bartoncik 17
People's Party Issues Statement *[CTK]* 17
Hanak To View Case After Elections *[CTK]* 18
Havel Remarks on Candidacy *[CTK]* 18

Civic Forum Urges Discussion *[CTK]* 18
President's Adviser Comments *[Prague Radio]* 18
Letter Read at News Conference *[Prague Radio]* 19
Ruml Explains TV Statement *[Prague Radio]* 19
Rychetsky Discusses 'Scandal' *[Prague Radio]* 20
Bartoncik Called 'Paid Agent' *[CTK]* 21
People's Party Officials on Case *[CTK]* 21
Uhl on Collaborator Identifications *[CTK]* 22
Jan Budaj Withdraws Council Candidacy *[CTK]* 22
Party Officials on Resignation *[Bratislava Radio]* 22
Budaj on StB Collaboration *[CTK]* 23
Stepan To Be Tried 'Behind Closed Doors' *[SVOBODNE SLOVO 2 Jun]* 24
News Conference on Former Officials' Prosecution *[VEREJNOST 2 Jun]* 24
Diplomatic Relations Established With Namibia *[Prague Radio]* 24
Military Alliances' New Situation Viewed *[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 5 Jun]* 24

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Editorial Views Warsaw Pact, NATO Summit *[Albrecht in NEUE ZEIT 9 Jun]* 26
Meckel, EC Official on Integration Process *[ADN]* 27
De Maiziere Expects 'Huge Economic Upswings' *[ADN]* 27
Expected To Present Gorbachev Plan *[Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 11 Jun]* 27
Speaks at Georgetown University *[Hamburg DPA]* 28
Addresses U.S. Businessmen *[ADN]* 28
'Very Satisfied' With Bush Meeting *[ADN]* 29
Wants Talks on Spy Problems *[Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 9-10 Jun]* 29
Diestel Orders Registration of Stasi Officers *[NEUE ZEIT 9 Jun]* 30
FRG Spies Reportedly Called Home *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 4 Jun]* 30
Wolf Rejects KGB 'Takeover' Rumor *[ADN]* 30

HUNGARY

Antall on Warsaw Pact, Troop Withdrawals *[Budapest TV]* 32
Warsaw Pact Meeting Favorably Assessed *[Barabas in NEPSZAVA 9 Jun]* 33
Soviet Troop Withdrawal Continues on Schedule *[MTI]* 34
Jeszenszky on Foreign Policy by National Interest *[NEPSZAVA 2 Jun]* 34
Views EC Membership *[MTI]* 35
National Assembly Session Ends; Agenda Noted *[MTI]* 35
Democratic Forum Pledges Support to Antall *[MTI]* 36
Plan for Settling Land Ownership Submitted *[Budapest Radio]* 36
Serb Democratic Federation Holds Meeting *[MTI]* 36
Holding Company To Launch Business Newsletter *[MTI]* 37

POLAND

Poll Compares U.S., USSR Popularity *[POLITYKA 19 May]* 38
Border Treaty With Germany, Reparations Wanted *[Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG 3 Jun]* 39
Jaruzelski on German Unification Issue *[PAP]* 39
Walesa on Creating Political Pluralism *[Paris LE MONDE 10-11 Jun]* 40
OKP Christian Democrats on Media, Walesa *[PAP]* 41
Result of Lublin By-Election Announced *[Warsaw Radio]* 41
* Centrists Issue Political Platform *[TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC 18 May]* 41

ROMANIA

Further on Dialogue With Hunger Strikers *[ROMPRES]* 44
Government Communique on Talks *[ROMPRES]* 44
Hunger Strikers' Statement on Dialogue *[ROMPRES]* 44
Antigovernment Demonstration in Victory Square *[ROMPRES]* 44
Police Intervene 'With Great Brutality' *[Vienna Radio]* 45

Doina Cornea Letter to Iliescu on 'Hunger Martyrs' *[ROMANIA LIBERA 2 Jun]* 45
More on Interior, Defense Ministries Controversy *[ADEVARUL 6 Jun]* 46
Article Calls on Government To Be More Open *[ADEVARUL 7 Jun]* 46
Journalist Paler's Sincerity Questioned *[LIBERTATEA 29 May]* 47
Paler Deplores Ambassador Paleologu's Discharge *[ROMANIA LIBERA 2 Jun]* 47
Further on Market Economy Transition Strategy *[ROMPRES]* 48
Iliescu Views Market Economy in Japanese Interview *[ROMPRES]* 49
Prosecutor's Office Dismisses Prosecutor Mirescu *[ROMPRES]* 49
NPCDP Members Excluded from Party *[ROMPRES]* 50
Dimitru Dinca Excluded From People's Alliance *[ROMPRES]* 50
Timisoara Supreme Court Trial Continues *[ROMPRES]* 50
More on Trial of Andruta Ceausescu, Others *[Bucharest Radio]* 50
Prosecutor General on Revolution, Defendants *[ROMPRES]* 50
Daily Provides Figures on Revolution Casualties *[ROMPRES]* 51
'Hooligans' Break Into Journal's Headquarters *[ROMPRES]* 51
Free Exchange Party Holds Meeting *[ROMPRES]* 51
Craiova Meeting for Better Supplies, Transport *[ROMPRES]* 51
Domestic Trade Minister on Price Hike 'Rumors' *[ADEVARUL 1 Jun]* 51
Contracts With Foreign Trade Partners *[ROMPRES]* 52
Cooperation Agreement With EEC Expected *[ROMPRES]* 52
Iliescu, Roman Receive SPD Parliamentarians *[ROMPRES]* 52
Romanian Delegation From Hungary Visits *[ROMPRES]* 53
More on Romanian Minority Visit *[ROMPRES]* 53
Romanian, Bulgarian Environment Ministers Meet *[ROMPRES]* 53
Margaritescu Visits Cuba, Discusses Ties *[ROMPRES]* 54
1,526,000 Passports Issued to Romanians *[ROMPRES]* 54

YUGOSLAVIA

Slovene Defense Minister on Army's Future *[VJESNIK 3 Jun]* 55
Slovenia Radio, TV Assembly on New Statute *[TANJUG]* 55
BORBA Article Assesses Presidency, FEC *[2-3 Jun]* 56
Serbian SAWP President on Elections *[BORBA 1 Jun]* 57
SDS Chairman Raskovic Addresses Rally *[TANJUG]* 58
Serbian Opposition Plans Protest Rally 13 Jun *[TANJUG]* 58
Serbian SAWP on Protest Rally *[Belgrade Radio]* 58
Serbia Takes Over Kosovo Militia *[TANJUG]* 59
Bosnia's Durakovic on Serbian LC, SAWP Plans *[Belgrade Radio]* 59
Nine Parties Apply To Register in Bosnia *[TANJUG]* 59
Bosnian Muslim Leader on SDA Party Formation *[VECERNJI LIST 3 Jun]* 59
Croatian Socialist Party Appoints Team to SAWP *[TANJUG]* 60

Police Said to Beat Up French Ambassador, Wife

AU1206084090 Hamburg BILD in German 12 Jun 90 p 8

[Unattributed report: "Albanian Police Beat French Ambassador"]

[Text] Paris—Albanian policemen entered the French Embassy in Tirana and beat up French Ambassador Michel Boulmer and his wife. Diplomats say that this is not an isolated incident. Police are acting with increasing brutality in their search for dissidents.

Central Bank Wants Back in BIS as Shareholder

AU1106165290 Paris AFP in English 1528 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Basel, Switzerland, June 11 (AFP)—Albania wants to regain its position as a shareholder in the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), which it left in 1976, its Central Bank president Qirjako Mihali, said here Monday.

Mr. Mihali told Agence-France Presse on the sidelines of the BIS annual meeting that the presence here of Albania's Central Bank president for the first time since 1976 was a gesture reflecting his country's recent decision in favour of economic reforms.

"We are interested in having shares" in the BIS, he said.

The meeting offered a "great deal of opportunities for exchanges with different central banks," Mr. Mihali added.

But BIS president Wim Duisenberg threw cold water on the idea of Albania again becoming a shareholder. The structure of the BIS shareholding "is not under discussion," he told a press conference.

He stressed however that this did not prevent the BIS from having relations "with any country," as the bank made "no distinction between shareholders and non-shareholders."

Tirana Cited on Building of Nuclear Reactor

AU0806122690 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 6 Jun 90 p 8

[TANJUG report: "Albania Will Build a Nuclear Reactor"]

[Text] Belgrade—Albania has begun realizing the project to build a research nuclear reactor, Tirana radio reports.

The project envisages the construction of installations and laboratories for the production of radioisotopes and radiopharmaceutical preparations, as well as the installation of equipment for monitoring radioactivity and for nuclear medicine.

Albania will provide part of the funds for the project, and the United Nations will supply most of the funds for the reactor. Some of the money will be provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency with which Albania has been cooperating for some 20 years.

Tirana radio did not say where Albania will obtain the equipment for the nuclear reactor and from which countries the experts working on its construction will come.

State Viewed in Light of E. European 'Upheavals'

AU0906160190 Tirana ZERI I POPULLIT in Albanian 29 May 90 pp 3-4

[Article by Senior Lecturer Ismail Lleshi: "Freedom, Independence, and Socialism—An Indivisible Whole"]

[Excerpts] Following the upheavals which have taken place in East Europe, there is, by analogy, a hubbub of questioning about Albania's future path. Skeptics, unaware of Albania's historical and contemporary development, have called it anomalous and ask what will happen. Our well-wishers, who have known and valued Albania's distinctive voice in all the complicated currents of events since World War II, are interested. Meanwhile, the Albanian Workers Party [AWP] and the Albanian people, unshaken in their convictions and sure of the truth, have replied that the processes and phenomena of East Europe will not take place in Albania. If the last leaves concealing the withering of the trunk which had overtaken the countries of the East fell in the autumn of 1989, and socialism as an ideology and practice was also formally abandoned, and if these countries showed themselves to be trees blasted by the frost, the social order in Albania has bloomed throughout its life. Why? Because it is characterized by a strong internal situation, because the state which emerged from the war in our country has remained a state of the people, because the AWP has kept the initiative in its hands and its policies accord with the will of the masses, and because, from its very beginning, socialist Albania has had its own path of development.

The physiognomy of Albanian life in the last 50 years has been marked by an organic welding of the inspiration and leadership of socialist ideas with our national territory, the distinguished traditions of the progressive Albanian liberation movement, and the special conditions of a small country and people like ours, which has a definite geostrategic position. This has given the development of our society its own character and individuality, in strong contrast to the countries of East Europe. [passage omitted]

Our social order, which emerged from the people's revolution, was not dictated against the people's will, but was its most authentic expression. The construction of socialist society does not conflict with the views and desires of the broad strata of working people, but is an embodiment of their essential interests. Without this basis and support among the people, our people's power would soon fade away and fall, socialist social relations would be distorted and smothered, our socialist political orientation would not match reality and would collapse,

and our entire social order would not be able to stand for a single day. Our people have chosen their own road of development, and the process of socialist construction in our country therefore always moves ahead.

Ties between socialist sociopolitical organizations and the broad masses of working people are not fixed once and for all. Events in the countries of East Europe have showed that when these ties are shallow and superficial, and when there are no efforts to continually strengthen and perfect them, they can be undone; the masses can leave the road of socialism and even initiate and support the reimposition of capitalism. This fatal danger can be avoided when tangible and continual work is performed to ensure that the people feel and know that they alone are masters of the country and sovereign over its destiny. This work is also the essence of the measures the AWP is now taking and carrying out in order to deepen the revolutionization and democratization of our entire life. [passage omitted]

Because it is dialectically revolutionary, the party has always viewed reality as it is and has studied successes and shortcomings with a critical eye, drawing conclusions on what has to be done to advance socialism, always in the service of the interests of the people and the homeland. This has further increased the people's trust in the party and increased the party's authority and influence. This has made it possible for the people themselves to accept with full conviction the sole and undivided leadership of the AWP which, under our country's objective circumstances, has been and remains a basic condition, not only for the construction of socialism, but for the defense of the homeland's freedom and independence. Calls for multiparty pluralism, which would be a tool for weakening national unity and destroying socialism, have therefore met with no response or support among our people. [passage omitted]

Foreign propaganda, sometimes with hostile intentions and sometimes out of inadequate knowledge, has portrayed the development of our country in a distorting light, taking as benchmarks parameters from the industrial levels of developed countries, and offering their road as the most fruitful and perfect one.

However, the capitalist road is represented not only by the developed countries, but by many states, great and small, for whom this road is increasingly leading toward a swift downfall, as signs in East European countries also now indicate. An explanations for the standards and levels of even the developed capitalist countries must also be sought in the centuries of accumulation which they have achieved, the traditional exploitation of the working masses, and the colonialist and neocolonialist exploitation of other peoples and countries, all of which have offered them opportunities to create and use advanced technology. [passage omitted]

Parliamentary Election Results, Reactions Noted

Official Results Postponed

AU1106160290

[Editorial Report] Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian at 1538 GMT on 11 June carries an report by a woman reporter from the National Assembly in Sofia. The reporter states that Dimitur Popov, secretary of the Central Electoral Commission, has issued "a very important announcement." There follows a two-minute recorded statement by Popov.

Popov first states that the National Public Committee for Guaranteeing Free Elections has received reports concerning alleged violations of the Law on Elections for the Grand National Assembly, and that the Central Electoral Commission is investigating all such reports. Popov says that "in connection with this, the Central Electoral Commission held a meeting today which assessed the course of the work on counting the votes and establishing the final results of the elections." Popov then explains the volume and the demanding nature of vote counting, which "must be carried out with particular attention." Popov then states that "to not permit any mistakes, the Central Electoral Commission informs the Bulgarian citizens and all those interested in the results of the elections for a Grand National Assembly that the Commission will announce the results of the elections tomorrow, 12 June 1990." Popov stresses that the postponement of the announcement of the results has been made solely "to ensure the safety and stability of the results." Popov gives no precise time for announcing the results.

More Results Announced

AU1206064090 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0600 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] At the beginning of our newscast, dear listeners, we switch to our reporters' studio in the National Assembly. Lili Yancheva reports:

[Yancheva] Yesterday we reported some of the election results. Now we have more results. Dimitur Popov, secretary of the Central Election Commission, is in our studio. Please, give us the new results.

[Popov] Good morning. The computers worked throughout the night. We kept receiving the protocols from the multi-mandate constituencies, and now we are approaching the end of the calculating process for the single-mandate constituencies. We can report that 111 people's deputies have already been elected. One of them is independent; one belongs to the Social-Democratic Party (Non-Marxist); one belongs to the Fatherland Union; eight belong to the Movement for Rights and Freedoms; 68 belong to the Bulgarian Socialist Party; and 32 belong to the Union of Democratic Forces.

In 84 single-mandate constituencies no candidate received an absolute majority. This means that the two candidates who received most votes will compete in a second round on 17 June.

We have checked absolutely all protocols we have received. It was established that more than 95 percent of all protocols have been signed by the members of the election commissions without any remarks. The rest of the protocols are accompanied by remarks or special observations, which are being studied by the Central Election Commission.

[Yancheva] How will you continue your work today?

[Popov] As until now, our work will continue to be strenuous. We have already fed the multi-mandate constituencies protocols to the computers, and they are being processed at the moment. We hope that by noon we will receive all protocols from all multi-mandate constituencies, and will feed them to the computers. We will be able to report more partial results throughout the day.

[Yancheva] This is our information so far. At the first opportunity, when more information is available, we shall report again.

42% of Candidates Lack Majority

AU1206073690 Sofia BTA in English 0713 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, June 12 (BTA)—In 42 percent of the 200 single-member constituencies where candidates are elected according to the majority system no one of them won half of the vote and there will be a second round on June 17, the Central Electoral Commission (CEC) has announced this morning.

So far it is known that the number of candidates already elected is as follows: the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP)—68; the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS)—32; the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (MRF)—8; one candidate each of the Fatherland Union and the Social Democratic Party (Non-Marxist) (SDS-Non-Marxist); and one independent candidate.

There will be a second round of the elections in 84 constituencies. The elections in these 200 constituencies will determine half of the national representatives in the Grand National Assembly.

In most of the constituencies where a second round of the elections is to take place BSP candidates will compete with the candidates of the SDS.

It has been announced that 95 percent of the protocols of the election results in these constituencies were signed without any remarks; the other protocols were signed with minutes of dissent.

'Convincing SDS Victory' in Sofia

AU1206103190 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] Our reporter Zlatina Georgieva reports:

[Georgieva] I have the most recent data on the election results, which now will be reported by Dimitur Popov, secretary of the Central Election Commission. We listen with great attention.

[Popov] Good Day, let us begin with the news that interests the impatient citizens of Sofia. I will report the results of the elections in Sofia's single-mandate constituencies. There are 26 such constituencies. Only one of them—Nadezhda constituency—has not sent in the protocols of the election commission.

In 175th Sofia—Sredets constituency, Stefan Dimitrov Savov of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] was elected;

In 176th Sofia—Krasno Selo constituency, Dimitur Asenov Kumanov, SDS, was elected;

In 178th Sofia—Vuzrazhdane constituency, Professor Konstantin Georgiev Tsanev, SDS, was elected;

In 179th Sofia—Oborishte constituency, Metodi Grigorov Nedyalkov, SDS, was elected;

In 180th Sofia—Serdika constituency, Aleksandur Panayotov Karakachanov, SDS, was elected;

In 181st Sofia—Poduyane constituency, Stefan Vasilev Stoyanov, SDS, was elected;

In 182d Sofia—Slatina constituency, Boyan Branimirov Papazov, SDS, was elected;

In 184th Sofia—Lozenets constituency, Ventseslav Asenov Dimitrov, SDS, was elected;

In 185th Sofia—Triyaditsa constituency, Krasen Stefanov Stanchev, SDS, was elected;

In 187th Sofia—Ilinden constituency, Pirin Iliev Vodenicharov, SDS, was elected;

In 189th Sofia—Iskur constituency, Viktoriya Antonova Dimova, SDS, was elected;

In 190th Sofia—Iskur constituency, Zakhari Todorov Karamfilov, SDS, was elected;

In 193d Sofia—Studentski constituency, Stelyan Iliev Stoychev, SDS, was elected;

In 194th Sofia—Vitosha constituency, Todor Petrov Kolev, SDS, was elected;

In 195th Sofia—Ovcha Kupel constituency, Angel Lyubenov Akhryanov, SDS, was elected;

In 196th Sofia—Lyulin constituency, Aleksandur Asenov Dzherov, SDS, was elected;

In 197th Sofia—Lyulin constituency, Georgi Evdokiev Markov, SDS, was elected;

In 198th Sofia—Vrubnitsa constituency, Mikhail Asenov Mikhaylov, SDS, was elected.

Thus only SDS candidates were elected in 18 of the 26 Sofia single-mandate constituencies. A convincing blue [SDS color] victory in the Sofia single-mandate constituencies.

In the other constituencies the situation is as follows: They number seven. No candidate was elected there because no candidate succeeded in gaining the necessary majority. On 17 June, in the second round, only candidates of the SDS and the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] will compete:

In 177th Sofia—Krasno Selo constituency, Edvin Stefanov Sugarev, SDS, will compete against Yavor Dimitrov Zartov, BSP;
In 183d Sofia—Chervena Zvezda constituency, Rumen Iliev Vodenicharov, SDS, will compete against Krustyo Goranov Ankov, BSP;
In 186th Sofia—Krasna Polyana constituency, Yanaki Boyanov Stoilov, BSP, will compete against Manush Romanov Demirev, SDS;
In 191st Sofia—Mladost constituency, Dragomir Pavlov Draganov, BSP, will compete against Lyubomir Ivanov Goshev, SDS;
In 192d Sofia—Mladost constituency, Vladimir Khristov Sotirov, SDS, will compete against Dimitur Mikhaylov Ivanov, BSP;
In 199th Sofia—Kremikovtsi constituency—Rumen Petrov Danov, SDS, will compete against Nikola Grigorov Andreev, BSP;
In 200th Sofia—Novi Iskur constituency, Petko Georgiev Ogoyski, SDS, will compete against Deyan Ignatov Rizov, BSP.

As I already said, we await only the results from 188th Sofia—Nadezhda constituency.

Now I will report the first results of the elections in five multiple-mandate constituencies. I will only report the number of votes cast for the major political parties:

In Vratsa, or Vratsa multiple-mandate constituency: 20,509 votes have been cast for the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union [BZNS]; SDS—58,484; BSP—116,189;
In Yambol multiple-mandate constituency: BZNS—10,799; SDS—39,717; BSP—74,791;
In Gabrovo multiple-mandate constituency: BZNS—17,857; SDS—51,922; BSP—48,651. In this constituency the Movement for Rights and Freedoms [MRF] has received 1,641 votes;
In Lovech multiple-mandate constituency: BZNS—17,590; SDS—53,373; BSP—67,509; MRF—2,036;
In Mikhaylovgrad multiple-mandate constituency: BZNS—15,307; SDS—45,827; BSP—93,186.

We will soon report the results of the elections in the single- mandate constituencies in Sozopol, Simitli, Elin-Pelin, Erkovo, and Lukovit. For those constituencies we are still awaiting the results of the voting of Bulgarian citizens living abroad.

[Georfieva] We are pleased with this information. When can we expect an additional report?

[Popov] At 1500 [1200 GMT] we will have even more detailed information. Then we will read the names of all candidates, who have won the elections in their constituencies.

BSP Leaders Defeated in Sofia

AU1206112090 Sofia BTA in English 1058 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, June 12 (BTA)—After the announcement of the official results of the elections in the majority-based single-member constituencies in Sofia, it became known that the SDS [Union of Democratic Forces] got the landslide here.

The candidates of the SDS have an overwhelming majority of the votes in 18 of the 26 single-member constituencies in the capital; on June 17 there will be a second round in seven constituencies where SDS and BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] candidates will compete; the election results from one constituency have not been received yet.

The following BSP candidates were outvoted:

Chavdar Kyuranov, member of the Presidium of the BSP Supreme Council, lost to Ventseslav Dimitrov, economic expert of the SDS; Stefan Prodev, editor-in-chief of the BSP DUMA daily, lost to the leader of the Green Party Aleksandur Karakachanov; Petur-Emil Mitev, leader of the Road to Europe BSP Platform, lost to the actor Todor Kolev; BSP candidate Yordan Velichkov, head of the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, lost to Boyan Papazov, playwright and script-writer.

Besides Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov and Rumen Serbezov, secretary of the Presidium of the BSP Supreme Council, some other BSP leaders will also have to wait for the second round to see if they will be elected in the majority-based single-member constituencies.

Army General Dobri Dzhurov, minister of national defense, who was mentioned as the most popular political figure in the country in a number of enquiries held before the elections, gathered 42 per cent of the votes in the first round and will have to run in the second round against Yordan Vasilev, literary critic and editor-in-chief of the SDS DEMOKRATSIYA paper, who also won 42 per cent of the votes.

BSP Deputy Chairman Georgi Pirinski and Filip Bokov, member of the Presidium of the BSP Supreme Council, will compete in the second round with SDS candidates.

Judging by data received by 1200 [0900 GMT] hrs, no member of the supreme leadership has been elected so far.

Winners, Losers Named

AU1106181690 Sofia BTA in English 1747 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, June 11 (BTA)—Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov, member of the leadership of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP), was not elected in the first round of the majority-system based elections in the town of Pleven. On June 17 he will compete with an unknown candidate of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) in the second round.

Rumen Serbezov, secretary of the Presidium of the BSP Supreme Council, will also run in the second round. Nora Ananieva, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Boyko Dimitrov, minister of foreign affairs (both candidates of the BSP) were elected in the first round.

According to incomplete data about the election results in the single-member constituencies received at the BTA, the representatives of the BSP have an advantage over the nominees of the SDS. The ratio is 48-50 per cent to 28-30 per cent in favour of the BSP candidates.

In about 20 per cent of the constituencies there will be a second round of the elections in which the candidates of the BSP will compete with the those of the SDS; in some constituencies the candidates of the BSP will run against the Movement for Rights and Freedoms.

It is worth noting that journalist Stefan Prodev, editor-in-chief of the BSP DUMA daily, lost to Aleksandur Karakachanov, the leader of the Green Party; Petur Slabakov, an actor and leader of Ecoglasnost, lost to Klara Marinova, a TV journalist and candidate of the BSP; and that Prof. Petur-Emil Mitev, leader of the Road to Europe BSP Platform, lost to the candidate of the SDS Todor Kolev, popular Bulgarian actor.

In Sofia the candidates of the SDS won in 16 single-member constituencies and there will be a second round in the other 10 where the candidates of the SDS and the BSP will compete.

So far only the candidates of three parties and coalitions have won in the single-mandate constituencies of the BSP, of the SDS and of the Movement for Rights and Freedoms in the regions densely populated by ethnic Turks.

The elections will be held for the second time in two constituencies because there were breaches of procedure and mistakes were made in the calculation of votes.

The Central Electoral Commission informed that it will announce the final election results tomorrow in the evening.

SDS Says No Coalition With BSP

AU1106160090 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1520 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Nina Spasova report on rally of Union of Democratic Forces in front of the People's Palace of Culture in Sofia—live]

[Text] Greeted with chants, Petur Beron, secretary of the Union of Democratic Forces [UDF] Coordination Council appeared at the rostrum. He stated that the

objective of this rally is to assess the results of the first round of elections and to decide how to proceed from this point.

This is the end of the one-party system, Petur Beron stated. The opposition is a fait accompli, and the past cannot be repeated. We must know that thanks to the percentages which the UDF won in the first round of the elections it will be capable of (?vetoing) all decisions of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] in the future National Assembly, he said. This was the statement of the UDF leadership to the rally: None of our parties has any intention of entering a coalition with the Socialists, Dr. Petur Beron declared.

At this very moment we hear the voice of Zhelyu Zhelev, chairman of the UDF Coordination Council. He states that manipulations were committed during the elections and the UDF demands that the results of the elections should be revised in those places where the proceedings had been grossly and illegal violated. This means that the election results should be annulled in those places. Zhelyu Zhelev's speech continues, we shall further inform you on the rally.

SDS Holds News Conference

AU1106175690 Sofia BTA in English 1704 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Even These Results Suit Opposition Goals"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, June 11 (BTA)—"We have objections as to the way the elections were held. In other circumstances the results would have been different. But even those obtained now are not bad, because we will be able to achieve our ends," Georgi Spasov, spokesman of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS), stated at an improvised news conference this afternoon.

He presented some data showing that there were violations of the election process in Veliko Turnovo where he ran as a candidate for the Grand National Assembly. According to him the distribution of the voters in polling stations of 600 and 1,800 people was deliberate. During the process of voting there were propagandists of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) in all polling stations. He gave the names of BSP activists and trade union figures who drove elderly people to the polling stations and gave them envelopes with the red BSP ballot papers "to make it easier for them." Spasov said he had the names of people who voted with old-version passports which were replaced six years ago. There are data showing that other people cast their votes in polling stations in the electoral registers of which their names were not entered. According to him, by 10 o'clock in the morning the blue ballot papers of the SDS were no longer available. He also mentioned threats made on the part of mayors.

Asked to comment on the statements made by the foreign guests that the elections were normal, another opposition leader, Petur Beron, explained: "It is difficult for people who are not accustomed to our conditions to detect the violations in the provinces we mentioned." He confirmed that the manipulations and the threats came from the local nomenclature which has remained unchanged after Zhivkov was ousted. "Did the foreign guests manage to gather reliable information when the 'regenerative process' was going on (the forcible change of the names of ethnic Turks)?" asked Plamen Darakchiev, who was in the southern town of Kurdzhali on the day of election.

Angel Akhryanov, another opposition candidate, called into question the forecast of the West German Institute INFAS. There were 62 polling stations in his constituency and they chose no one else but "exactly and solely" polling station 12. Ahryanov said it was the polling station for the military men of the allegedly depoliticized Army who live in the blocks of flats there and his BSP rival took the lead only in this district. "On the night of the most scarce information INFAS bombarded the Bulgarian people with dubious data," Akhryanov stated.

"The leaders of the Communist Party lost the direct struggle," Petur Beron said, commenting on the results of the majority system elections. "Dzhurov, Lukanov, Lilov, Pirinski, Bokov and Kyuranov lost," he stated, but added that some of them (he did not specify who) will run in the second round. "We stand a fair chance of outrunning them, all the more that we can unite with another opposition force," Georgi Spasov said.

"Today 24 trucks of doubtful registration were parked opposite the people who stood unarmed in front of the National Assembly," Petur Markov, chairman of the New Social Democratic Party, stated. He saw trucks with "people" in the Oborishte Street near parliament, too.

Minutes before the opposition leaders left to take part in a session of the Coordinating Council of the SDS, Plamen Darakchiev expressed the opinion that two paths are open before the opposition now either to admit it has stumbled or to accuse the government. Darakchiev seems more inclined not to blame it on the people. "But the ratio in the preliminary election results announced so far is catastrophic, because the polarization between the Bulgarians remains," he said.

BSDP Leader Against Joining Coalition

AU1106162690 Sofia BTA in English 1553 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Opposition Will Remain United, Dr. Dertliev Says"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, 11 Jun (BTA)—"We will stay in opposition until our absolute victory," Dr. Petur Dertliev, chairman of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party (BSDP), told a BTA reporter who asked him if the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) would enter a future coalition government.

He denied the rumours that the BSDP and the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party are going to leave the SDS.

Dr. Petur Dertliev ruled out the possibility of forming a coalition government with the participation of the SDS, the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BZNS) and the Movement for Rights and Freedoms which maybe will take a total of about 50 per cent of the seats in parliament.

The leader of the BSDP heads the SDS ticket in a multi-member constituency and no doubt he will be returned to the Great National Assembly.

Agrarians To Back SDS in 2d Round

AU1206124090 Sofia BTA in English 1151 GMT 12 Jun 90

["BZNS Will Support SDS in the Second Round"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, June 12 (BTA)—The Standing Committee of the BZNS [Bulgarian National Agrarian Union] calls upon all members of the party to cast their votes for the candidates of the SDS [Union of Democratic Forces] in the second round of the Grand National Assembly elections; they will compete with BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] candidates in at least 80 constituencies.

The BZNS has been the subservient ally and satellite of the ruling Communist Party for 40 years and held formally two or three ministerial posts. It is pointed out in the declaration made today that the votes the BZNS won are a little less than expected which is due to the fact that people are still scared and that the election campaign in the villages had been manipulated.

The BZNS will probably have about eight per cent of the votes in the proportional-representation-based constituencies; no BZNS candidate has been elected in the majority-based single-member constituencies.

In the declaration, an appeal is made to the BZNS supporters to vote for those candidates of the SDS who, mainly in the provinces, are members of the other agrarian party, the Nikola Petkov BZNS.

The Agrarian Party split 42 years ago, when the Communist Party usurped the power after falsifying the elections for a National Assembly and crushing the opposition. The then leader of the opposition Agrarians, Nikola Petkov, was hanged. Until the middle of November 1989 the Nikola Petkov BZNS was banned. When it was restored, the members of the official BZNS joined it in large numbers. The question of the unification of the two parties was discussed several times, but it was postponed until after the elections because of the commitment of the Nikola Petkov BZNS to the SDS.

In actual fact today's appeal of the BZNS Standing Committee means that the unification has become a reality.

The Nikola Petkov BZNS is the biggest of the 16 parties and organizations united by the SDS.

At last night's SDS rally in Sofia the orange banner of the BZNS was hoisted side by side with the blue one of the SDS.

BZNS Assesses Results

AU1206110790 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 12 Jun 90

["Declaration" issued by the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union; place and date not given]

[Text] The first round of the elections for the Grand National Assembly ended. The results achieved by the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union [BZNS] are a bit lower than we expected. The reasons will profoundly be analyzed, however, we already can say that the fear inherent in the last 40 years to the Bulgarian people and the manipulation of the elections in the villages on the eve of the voting, are among the main reasons, the declaration reads.

As an independent opposition party, that decisively calls for democratizing sociopolitical life in the country, the BZNS appeals to all its members, supporters, and sympathizers, to support the candidates of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], and first of all the candidates of the "Nikola Petkov" BZNS candidates, if there are such candidates, in the second round of the elections on 17 June.

Simultaneously we appeal for calm and tolerance and avoiding any actions that could exacerbate the situation. In the struggle for democracy we shall steadily follow the line pointed out by the 36th BZNS Extraordinary Congress, the declaration of the BZNS Permanent board reads.

Demonstrations at Sofia SDS Rally, Elsewhere

Militia on 'Tension' in Sofia

AU1106115490 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1140 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Major Nikolay Nikolov, spokesman for the Sofia Directorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, has just reported the following:

At about 1300 [1000 GMT] the situation in Sofia was relatively calm. Nevertheless, compared with yesterday, political passions appear to be more heated. The following are the city's trouble spots, which right now command our public's attention:

The first is at 134 Rakovski Street, in front of the Union of Democratic Forces [UDF/SDS] headquarters, where between 200 and 300 UDF supporters are occupying the sidewalk and street. One of them is lying on the pavement. The city's transportation system and all personal cars have been diverted from this part of the city.

Tension has increased in the square in front of the National Assembly building, where at the moment the

Central Election Commission is working. At about 1230 [0930 GMT] between 2,500 and 3,000 UDF supporters broke through the militia cordon in front of the building and right now part of them are on the steps, very near the building's doors. The constant chanting undoubtedly aggravates the Central Election Commission's work.

The People's Militia organs are making every effort to protect public order in Sofia. Additional troops have been mobilized. We appeal to all political forces supporters to show prudence, political culture, patience, and tolerance until and after the final election results are announced. If necessary, the People's Militia organs will take all legal and decisive measures to prevent and intercept any violations of public order, said Major Nikolay Nikolov, spokesman of the Sofia Directorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Demonstrators: Election 'Rigged'

AU1106122890 Paris AFP in English 1222 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Sofia, 11 Jun (AFP)—Several thousand young supporters of the liberal opposition demonstrated here Monday [11 June] claiming that Sunday's elections were "rigged" in favour of the Bulgarian ex-communist Socialist Party, which appears to have won a clear victory. The view was contradicted by international observers who said Monday they had found no irregularities during the first round of voting on Sunday.

The protestors, who support the fledgling Union of Democratic Forces [UDF/SDS] alliance, chanted "Down with the BSP" and "BSP Mafia". One group tore down a Socialist Party banner and set it on fire.

The demonstrators broke through a police cordon outside parliament to gather in front of the entrance to the National Assembly.

During the morning, hundreds of UDF supporters staged a sit-in outside the UDF headquarters in Rakowski Street in the city centre.

Throughout the night demonstrators kept vigil outside the Palace of Culture housing the international press centre and the television studio covering the country's first free election in 44 years.

The UDF was the BSP's main challenger in the election. Estimates published by the West German opinion poll institute INFAS, credited the BSP with 47.6 per cent and the UDF with 36.2 per cent of the vote. [passage omitted]

Despite many protests by the opposition, the first round of voting was held without major fraud being committed, international observers said. Some said they noted irregularities but ones which would not influence the outcome.

The various teams of observers sent by the Council of Europe, the European Democratic Union [EDU] of Conservative and Christian Democratic parties and various national parliaments told a press conference that the first round appeared generally to have been open and fair.

However, Michele Alliot-Marie of the EDU said that if some major instances of fraud reported Sunday night by the UDF were verified, then this would "radically modify the EDU's assessment about the June 10 elections".

Ms. Alliot-Marie said the BSP's victory was probably helped by the short life and inexperience of the UDF which had not had enough time to publicise its ideas and programme.

No incidents were reported during Sunday's voting in which the turnout was given officially as 83 per cent. [passage omitted]

SDS Denies Organizing Protest

AU1106130690 Sofia BTA in English 1234 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, 11 Jun (BTA)—A spontaneous rally of SDS [Union of Democratic Forces—UDF] adherents continues to block the traffic in front of the Union of the Democratic Forces headquarters in Sofia, expressing discontent with the preliminary results of the elections voiced here and expecting official data. Some of the SDS followers are suspicious of falsifications. Others expressed in front of BTA representatives their discontent with the way in which the election campaign was carried [out].

The free will of the people was not expressed at these elections. Sofia did this but the people in the country were suppressed. The elections should have taken place a few months later so as the country could waken up, an elderly supporter of the opposition said.

A representative of the SDS press center said that this event is not organized by the SDS leadership. From the SDS building the 200 people gathered in front of the building were called by megaphone to go home but it was all in vain.

Similar spontaneous actions of SDS adherents are taking place in front of the National Assembly building and the International Press Center at the National Palace of Culture.

The demonstrators in front of the National Assembly have broken the police ring and are standing closely on the steps of the official entrance.

A source of the press center of the Transport Police refuted in front of BTA representative allegations about movement of columns of private cars from the country to Sofia. We have no such information. The car traffic in the country is quite normal for an ordinary day of the week, the source said.

Militia Appeals for Calm

AU1106141490 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The Directorate of the People's Militia has issued an announcement. According to it, the situation in the country in the afternoon is normal. No grave crimes, incidents, or gross violations of public order have been registered. The militia organs have taken all legal and necessary measures to prevent the development of political passions into violations of law.

All Bulgarian citizens, representatives of the various political forces, have been called upon to prevent violations of the law and public order by their behavior, the announcement reads.

Zhelev, Dertliev Address Rally

AU1106163290 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1530 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Nina Spasova report on rally of Union of Democratic Forces in front of the People's Palace of Culture in Sofia on 11 June—live]

[Text] Zhelyu Zhelev's speech has just ended. What I can tell you about the speech is that Doctor Zhelev stated as follows: We agreed within the Union of Democratic Forces, SDS, that we shall not enter any coalition with the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] and that this decision reflects the total unity of the opposition. The SDS will remain in opposition as long as the correlation of forces does not change. We think that we should not consider the results of the most recent elections as a defeat, Zhelyu Zhelev further said, and this is the great [word indistinct] of the Bulgarian opposition. As long as the violations against election proceedings do not turn out to be more numerous and more rude, we shall proceed toward the next round of elections.

Responding to the chants: "New elections, new elections," Zhelyu Zhelev addressed the crowd and said that the Union of Democratic Forces is not interested in new elections for the time being.

After Zhelyu Zhelev, the floor was given to Milan Drenchev, Liliana Pandelieva, and to Dr. Petur Dertliev who greeted the crowd [words indistinct]. Now Doctor Petur Beron is speaking again. [passage indistinct]

More on Leaders' Statements

AU1106201990 Sofia BTA in English 1935 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Opposition Has Not Lost the Elections, SDS Leadership Says"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, June 11 (BTA)—Today the leadership of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) cast their votes again and confirmed their decision the SDS will not form a coalition with the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP). Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev, leader of the SDS, told the thousands of SDS supporters who had gathered for a rally.

Besides the blue flags of the SDS and the green flags of the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party, the orange flags of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BZNS) could also be seen to flutter in the square in front of the National Palace of Culture. The people chanted "we are deceived," "we won't work for the red," "all against the BCP."

Zhelyu Zhelev pointed out it would be a mistake to think that the SDS had lost the elections. It was to our interest either to win the elections by 65-70 per cent of the vote or to become a strong opposition inside the National Assembly which the preliminary results show that we will be, he said. Dr. Zhelev announced that the leadership of the SDS had confirmed its decision for the unity of the opposition in parliament. According to him it would not be to the interest of the SDS to insist on holding second elections. The SDS will demand to repeat the elections only in the places where there have been violations. There the results should be nullified and new partial elections should be held.

Dr. Petur Beron drew attention to the fact that no one of the united SDS parties intends to enter a coalition with the BSP. Nikolay Vasilev, the leader of the Alternative Socialist Party (ASP) which recently split from the BSP, called upon all supporters and members of the ASP to vote for the SDS. According to Dr. Petur Dertliev, chairman of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party (BSDP), by the end of this year the BSP could hardly expect to attract more than 10 per cent of the electorate.

Almost all leaders of the SDS parties and organizations took the floor at the rally, including Prof. Aleksandur Chirkov and Angel Akhryanov of the BSDP and Aleksandur Yordanov of the Radical Democratic Party (RDP) candidates of the SDS who already won the elections. The leader of the Green Party Aleksandur Karakachanov who won against Stefan Prodev, editor-in-chief of the DUMA daily, said that if the SDS won more than one-third of the vote in the present conditions, then this is the moral victory of the opposition.

Responding to the appeal made by one of the speakers, after the rally the crowds of people went to the courtyard of Sofia University where many of them will wait all night for the decision of the Central Electoral Commission concerning the field reports about violations of the elections.

Situation Said 'Serious'

AU1206072490 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0656 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] We have just received an announcement of the People's Militia. It reads:

In connection with the numerous protests and phone calls from citizens to Sofia's Directorate of Internal Affairs related to violations of public peace and order,

we report that after the end of the 11 June rally of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], large groups of people disregarded the instructions of the organs of law and order and created problems and difficulties until the late night hours for the city traffic along Tolbukhin and Vitosha Boulevards, Rakovski and Shipka Streets, the area around the Palace of Culture, 9 September Square, and the area around the Bulgarian Television office and Kliment Okh dski University.

Some citizens sat on the ground on Tolbukhin and Ruski Boulevards, created great difficulties for the normal city traffic, and stopped cars, including those of the emergency service and the People's Militia.

Drivers of personal cars in convoys of 5-6 vehicles sounded their horns and flashed their lights, disrupting the night peace. In many places in Sofia campaign material of the political parties—posters, banners, and so forth—was destroyed and burned. The temporary stage in 9 September Square was also burned down.

When warned about the violations of the public order, the violators behaved crudely and provocatively, created conflicts, and sought clashes with the law and order organs.

The situation continues to be serious at present. Traffic along Rakovski Street and near Kliment Okhridski Sofia University has been badly disrupted. Students from the Independent Student Associations Federation have begun a strike. During the night the students broke into the university building.

All this represents a crude violation of public order. The People's Militia organs are taking all legal and necessary measures to ensure peace and calm in Sofia, the announcement reads.

Rural Protests Noted

AU1206073090 Sofia BTA in English 0716 GMT 12 Jun 90

["Demonstrations in Support of Opposition"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, June 12 (BTA)—Demonstrators celebrating the victory of the opposition candidates for the Grand National Assembly in Sofia put fire to a platform in the Central Deveti Septemvri Square opposite the building of the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP). As it was far from the buildings in the vicinity, there have not been any serious damages. This temporary platform has stood in the square for five days, forgotten after the last rally the BSP held there before the elections.

Last night after the big rally of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) at which the leaders of the opposition coalition declared that the results are not a loss but a victory of democracy and freedom-loving, thousands of SDS supporters were breaking the peace of the night and hindered the traffic in some of the central streets for several hours. The people waved blue flags and chanted slogans in support of the opposition and against the BSP and cars with hi headlights and blaring hooters ran along the streets.

The Department of the Ministry of the Interior in Sofia announced that the demonstrators behaved arrogantly and rudely with the militiamen, provoked conflicts and challenged them. But there were no incidents.

Reports from the country also inform about demonstrations of opposition supporters who accuse the authorities of falsifying the elections. There were mass demonstrations in Veliko Turnovo, Ruse, Varna, Stara Zagora, Sliven and in some other places. There were no gross breaches of the peace.

Everywhere the Coordinating Councils of the SDS branches distanced themselves from the demonstrations and underlined that they burst spontaneously at the initiative of the people.

Demonstrators Interviewed

AU1206110990 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Nina Spasova report]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Our listeners are still phoning in trying to find out what is happening in Sofia's streets. Our reporter Nina Spasova is in the studio:

[Spasova] About 30 minutes ago we visited the sensitive spots in Sofia. The picture is as follows: The situation in the squares in front of the National Assembly and the Palace of Culture is completely calm. [passage omitted]

In front of the headquarters of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] on 134 Rakovski Street we met a group of about 100 citizens who were blocking the street. The street is still closed and the trolley buses cannot pass. An SDS representative with a loudspeaker in his hand tried to convince the people to open the street to traffic.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified person speaking through a loudspeaker] Please, I am begging you, do not disrupt the city transportation. We all shall suffer because of it. If you love us I beg you....

[Second unidentified speaker] We do not love you! We are protesting against the manipulation of the elections! We have nothing in common with the SDS!

[Third unidentified speaker] I want to tell you that a short while ago the chief editor of the daily 21 read an article in which he said he supports the announcement of civil disobedience throughout the country. I would like to know, if civil disobedience is called for, why we cannot demonstrate for it?

[Spasova, speaking to same person] What is the meaning of your flag?

[Fourth unidentified speaker] Look, this is the flag of anarchism. The black signifies the protest of human personality against its oppression, while the red signifies those who have died for freedom. [end recording]

[Spasova, from the studio] The voices you heard belong to about 10 youths who are conducting a sit-in strike in front of the SDS headquarters and refuse to listen to the appeals of the representatives of the SDS and the People's Militia to open the street. The other citizens left the place.

Reporter Vesela Manova is also in the studio; she will report on the situation at the university.

[Manova] Unfortunately, no one is leaving the premises of Sofia University. People are still pouring in. I returned 10 minutes ago, and this is what I heard from the students who participated in the occupation strike announced yesterday throughout the university building.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] The strike will continue for three days. We began yesterday and were here the whole night. Our demands are listed here, and I hope the people will understand what we want.

[Manova] I have the impression that you are not a Bulgarian. Where do you come from?

[Unidentified speaker] I come from Czechoslovakia. [passage omitted]

[Manova] You are deputy rector of the university. How long have you been here?

[Deputy Rector] I have been here since 2130 yesterday.

[Manova] Is this because you want to be with your students, or simply because you cannot leave the building?

[Deputy Rector] Oh, no. I have no problems. The university leadership merely thinks that at this dangerous moment it must be at the university.

[Manova] What do you mean by a dangerous moment?

[Deputy Rector] What can I tell you? Yesterday, for example, people who have nothing to do with the university entered the building, people who were rather old to be students. Some of them were not in very good shape.... We were concerned that undesirable things could develop.

[Manova] Would you like to introduce yourself?

[Deputy Rector] Yes, I am Professor Panayot Donchev, deputy rector. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Minister Meets Students; No Results

AU1206115490 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1000 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Colonel General Atanas Semerdzhiev, minister of internal affairs, and students on strike in front of Sofia University had a meeting which lasted for approximately one hour, between 1000 and 1100 local time this morning.

Colonel Yordan Ormankov, spokesman of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Petur Beron, secretary of the Union of Democratic Forces, attended the meeting.

Following the meeting, Colonel Ormankov spoke to a BTA correspondent, sharing his impressions on the meeting. He stated as follows:

The efforts to persuade the 1,500-1,600 young people not to incite the citizens against each other and against the Union of Democratic Forces did not succeed. The good intentions have so far not produced any results.

Colonel General Semerdzhiev appealed to the people and told them that this was not the right way to proceed toward democracy. The students asked questions about the legitimity of the elections, about everyday life, and other problems which are causing them dissatisfaction.

Colonel Ormankov stated in conclusion: On the part of our ministry the good intentions remain.

Mladenov Announcement on Need for Tolerance

AU1106130090 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1237 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] We have just received an announcement from the Office of the President. It reads:

Today, 11 June, Petur Mladenov, head of state, invited to the Presidency the leadership of the Central Election Commission led by its chairman, Professor Zhivko Stalev, and the leaders of the Bulgarian Socialist Party, the Union of Democratic Forces, and the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union—Aleksandur Lilov, Zhelyu Zhelev, and Viktor Vulkov.

At the meeting, which was also attended by Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, Stanko Todorov, chairman of the National Assembly, and Atanas Semerdzhiev, minister of internal affairs, the conduct of the first round of the elections for the Grand National Assembly was discussed.

The announcement further reads:

The leadership of the Central Election Commission [CEC] briefed the president on the course of the election and assessed that the elections have taken place normally, in a peaceful and calm atmosphere. The commission is carefully studying the complaints concerning minor violations.

The leaders of the parties expressed their views and exchanged information on irregularities that have been allowed. The participants agreed to hand the information over to the CEC because, according to the law, it is the only organ entitled to verify and assess the reports of violations and adopt the appropriate decisions.

All participants in the meeting highly assessed the honest, responsible, and competent activity of the CEC. They were unanimous in expressing their complete confidence in the Commission, its leadership, and its chairman, Zhivko Stalev. The firm conviction was expressed that all conditions must be guaranteed for the Commission's further activity until the end of the elections. The need to avoid any action that could lead to increasing political tension in the country was pointed out. The participants in the meeting made an appeal to preserve the correct and tolerant atmosphere that was characteristic of election day and guarantee the completion of the free and democratic elections in Bulgaria, the announcements of the Office of the President read.

Lukanov Issues Statement on Elections

AU1106192890 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1730 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Speech by Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, on elections; place and date not given—read by announcer]

[Text] Dear fellow citizens, on 10 June 1990 Bulgaria took a great step forward toward the common goal we all share—the establishment of a truly democratic and free society in which every citizen's rights and personal dignity are reliably protected and guaranteed. The first round of elections for the Grand National Assembly proceeded in peace and in accordance with the rules of law and order, in a spirit of tolerance and with a shared sense of responsibility for Bulgaria's fate.

As Bulgarians we all have reasons to be proud of this day. We cannot fail to be satisfied with the positive evaluation of our foreign guests on the elections. They pointed out that Bulgaria has made considerable progress in its democratization, within a short period of time, which is reflected by the peaceful, free, and democratic spirit in which the elections proceeded.

In a democratic election under the conditions of a multiparty system victory is never certain for anyone. In elections such as the present ones there are no losers either. This is so because, in the final account, the victory of democracy is a common victory for all.

The Bulgarian nation faces complicated and urgent tasks today. These tasks cannot be postponed. We must now establish the foundations of our state ruled by law by adopting a new Constitution. We are expected to implement a radical and total economic reform.

Along with this, we must guarantee the Bulgarian citizens' most essential social needs and interests. We must find a lasting and democratic solution for the nationality issue. We must create solid guarantees for our motherland's security and territorial intergrity in a rapidly changing world. We must win a worthy place in this world, we must totally open up for wholeheartedly partaking of its values and achievements, by preserving our national independence and uniqueness at the same time.

All this can be accomplished only under one absolute condition: On these questions which are nationwide, which are above party, group, and individual interests, we must reach a national consensus and cooperation. The elections provide prerequisites for this.

Let us not miss our historical opportunities and in relying on the Bulgarian people's freely expressed will, let us join together the efforts of all sociopolitical forces, the efforts of all real patriots, so that we may work together for the sake and to the benefit of Bulgaria. Let us place Bulgaria above our goals and ambitions; let us not permit the tension and the sometimes exacerbating polemics of the election campaign to be transferred to the post-election period. This would be harmful for our country—no one would profit from it.

The government considers the guarantee of stability and peace in the country in the forthcoming crucial days and weeks as its primary obligation. We urge all political forces and all citizens to show their wisdom and common sense, to be tolerant, and to respect each other.

We should not give in to the habit of confrontation, we should not listen to unreliable rumors and fabrications about some kind of repressive intentions of the state authorities. This is absurd, considering that it contradicts the very logic of the innovative process that started on 10 November 1989.

The government, including its law and order organs, proved that they respect democracy and human rights as lofty values of civilization. We shall do everything within our power to guarantee the security and peace of every Bulgarian citizen, under the conditions of extensive, democratic freedoms.

We appeal to the working people in this country, to the intelligentsia, to all Bulgarians, men and women, to pursue and successfully conclude the present election campaign, to preserve ourselves and our country from extremism and adventure, so that we may proudly say on 18 July that we are opening a happy, new page, in the Bulgarian people's centuries-old history.

Election Commission, Observers Comment

Results Seen as Open

AU1206103490 Sofia BTA in English 0936 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, June 12 (BTA)—The second round of the Grand National Assembly elections on June 17 will be decisive for the distribution of forces in the first freely and democratically elected Bulgarian parliament. The BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] may gain a considerable advantage over the opposition SDS [Union of Democratic Forces], but it is also possible that the seats will be

divided equally between these two forces and the SDS may even gain a small advantage. A coalition of the forces outside the BSP would put them in a more advantageous position.

This conclusion can be made by comparing the forecast made by the West German Institute INFAS about the results of the elections in the proportional-representation-based multi-member constituencies with the officially announced results of the elections held in the single-member constituencies according to the majority system.

A spokesman of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BZNS) stated this morning that in the second round his supporters will vote for the SDS candidates.

Last night the orange banner of the BZNS fluttered side by side with the blue flag of the SDS and Bulgaria's tricolour.

According to preliminary unofficial calculations, for the time being, the BSP has 166 seats in Parliament; The SDS—107, the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (MRF)—19, the BZNS— 16. Three seats are taken respectively by an independent candidate, a representative of the Fatherland Union (nonparty member) and a nominee of the SDP [Socialist-Democratic Party] (Non-Marxist).

At least 85 seats in parliament will be distributed after the second election round next Sunday. A second round will be held in the constituencies where the election procedure was violated or mistakes were made in calculating the votes. BSP and SDS candidates will compete in most constituencies on June 17; in some other constituencies the BSP candidates will run against the nominees of the MRF. The SDS will probably call upon its supporters to vote for the candidates of the MRF in the constituencies where they have not candidates of their own.

Commission Reviews Complaints

AU1106105690 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1000 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The BTA correspondent in Silistra reports that following election day, the delay in Dulovo caused added tension during processing of election data on the Dobrudzha municipalities voting in Razgrad Oblast. The commissions in this Dobrudzha city stopped work at 0700 [0400 GMT].

Meanwhile, during the night the 18th multi-deputy Silistra constituency's regional election commission reviewed results of the investigation into complaints and tip-offs about the various political parties and regional movements related to alleged violations in the area.

The commission rejected as unfounded two complaints by the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] concerning the quality of the party ballots' color and an irregular supply of ballots in some areas.

The third complaint by the Socialists was related to unlawful inspections by unauthorized people from the Union of Democratic Forces [UDF/SDS] in the election sections. The local UDF Coordination Council's attention has been directed to this complaint.

Another complaint related to the fact that in some election sections in Tutrakan region, namely in the villages of Sukhodol and Nozharevo, under-aged people of Turkish origin had voted. Similar attempts had been observed in other sections. The Central Election Commission has been consulted. Following these consultations, additional instructions have been issued to the section commissions.

Most of the reports of attempts to canvass in Turkish, local state leaders' participation in the election commissions, unproportional participation of various political forces in those commissions, and voting without observing the secrecy rules have been proven unfounded. Only in Surkovo Village, Silistra region, has it been established that after voting, page 19 of the voters' personal passports were not always properly marked.

Many of the reports and the UDF Silistra Coordination Council's official complaint were received between 1830 and 1900 [1530-1600 GMT], when it practically impossible to verify the complaint.

The second part of the UDF complaint is related to election campaign violations. This complaint again could not be verified.

Election Council's Sendov Remarks

AU1106143490 Sofia BTA in English 1342 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, 11 Jun (BTA)—If it turns out that the reports about violations and falsifications in calculating the results of the elections are true, it is very likely to hold new elections in some regions, Academician Blagovest Sendov of the Honest and Free Elections Public Council said to a group of journalists.

But it can be done only after the Central Electoral Commission (CEC) carries out a careful check of all reports about such breaches, Mr Sendov added.

Today the Public Council gathered at noon and had a three-hour-long session in the building of the National Assembly in front of which two or three thousand supporters of the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) are chanting in protest against the gross falsification they consider to have been made in some regions of the country.

Mr Sendov said that the tension was created after the announcement of the preliminary results sample made at night by the Independent West German Institute INFAS and the National Democratic Institute for International Relations of the U.S.A.

"Democracy is born in pains", the academician said.

He reminded that all results announced today by noon are preliminary and went on to say that although on the whole yesterday's elections passed peacefully and calmly, CEC had received reports about "a number of violations" which should be carefully checked up.

Another member of the Honest and Free Elections Public Council, Academician Asen Zhablenski, expressed regret that emotions are taking the upper hand in Sofia and underlined that CEC should study carefully all complaints.

It was advised that the news conference of the leaders of the three major political forces scheduled for 1400 today had been postponed and it would take place after the official results of the elections are announced. In the meantime INFAS announced the final results of their sample made on the basis of the votes for 200 seats in parliament taken according to the proportional representation system cast in 250 election districts.
Here are these results:
The Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP): 47.6 per cent of the vote (98 seats);
The Union of Democratic Forces (SDS): 36.2 per cent (75 seats);
The Bulgarian Agrarian Party (BZNS): 8.0 per cent (16 seats);
The Rights and Freedoms Movement (RFM): 5.7 per cent (11 seats);
All other parties and coalitions: 2.5 per cent
For Sofia the results are:
BSP: 39.1 per cent
SDS: 54.2 per cent
BZNS: 3.9 per cent
Other parties: 2.8 per cent

Pazardzhik Violations Confirmed

AU1106195490 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 1730 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] According to the latest data provided by the Central Electoral Commission on the results of the single-mandate system, 28 of the candidates of the Bulgarian Socialist Party have been elected, 19 candidates of the Union of Democratic Forces have been elected, 4 candidates of the Rights and Freedoms Movement have been elected, and 1 candidate of the Fatherland Union has so far been elected.

The Central Electoral Commission has decided that the results of the first round of National Assembly elections should be announced on 12 June. This was announced by Dimitur Popov, secretary of the Commission.

The commission also reviewed some warnings about irregularities in the election process. Because of errors committed in the counting of votes in the No. 90 Pazardzhik single-mandate constituency, the Commission announces that none of the candidates has obtained the necessary majority of votes. The Central Electoral Commission has decided that for this reason a second round of elections should be held between the two candidates who have obtained the greatest number of votes. They are Stoyan Ganev and Petur Nikolakov.

Observer: Vote 'Correct,' 'Impressive'

AU1106113490 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1000 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Helmut Opletal report from Sofia]

[Excerpt] Swiss Deputy Verena Grendlmayer, who observed the Bulgarian elections as a member of a Council of Europe delegation, stated today:

[Begin Grendlmayer recording] In my opinion and in the opinion of my colleagues, these elections were not only correct, but also very impressive. This not only means that obvious manipulations, irregularites, a lack of fairness, pressure, or things of that sort were not ascertained, but the election offices and the people to whom we talked impressed us by a general spirit of cooperation—for all parties were represented. This is all the more impressive because these people have not yet experienced what it means to have several parties. And the Bulgarian people proved to be extraordinarily fit for becoming a member of the Council of Europe soon. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Observers on 'Normal Course'

AU1106115090 Sofia BTA in English 1120 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, 11 Jun (BTA)—Voting here was held in a normal atmosphere, said this morning before journalists the representative of the European Democratic Union Michel Aliot-Marie [spelling as received]. Observers from the FRG, Norway, Greece, and France have visited about a hundred election desks. There have been nevetheless some incidents. Such is the case in the special polling desk for soldiers which could be identified globally but not individually. Observers were told that the soldiers have been threatened or promised certain privileges by their chiefs. At some of the places ready envelopes for the voting were offered. There is information that the SDS (Union of Democratic Forces) [UDF/SDS] blue ballots which [were] finished were not duly supplied and that this only happened after the arrival of observers.

These incidents however do not change the results substantially, Aliot-Marie said. She explains the predominance of the ruling party with the late appearance of the opposition and the early holding of elections which did not allow the SDS to spread outside the large cities.

"Our first impressions are favorable for Bulgaria's approximation to the European institutions," Miguel Angel Martinez said, who is a coordinator of the parliamentary delegation of the Council of Europe which should prepare a report for the Bulgarian elections. They have taken a normal course in a calm atmosphere, is the delegation opinion. There were no signs of outrages.

The same estimation was given by British, French, Soviet, Spanish, West German and Canadian guests of the elections who were invited by the Central Electoral Commission, the National Assembly and the Council of Ministers. "There are some spots here and there but the picture as a whole is frank," their generalization was. In reply to a question they explained that they cannot express opinion about the technical information and the summing up of the results.

Istanbul Says 17 Ethic Turks Elected

AU1106202190 Paris AFP in English 1503 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Ethnic Turks Not Satisfied With Bulgarian Election"—AFP headline]

[Text] Istanbul, June 11 (AFP)—The president of the Association for Solidarity with Balkan Turks here described the results of the Bulgarian election Monday [11 June] as "encouraging but not satisfying."

While pleased with the election of 17 deputies from the Turkish community in Bulgaria, association president Mehmet Cavus complained of irregularities, saying the Turkish community had hoped "for a better score in the first round."

Mr. Cavus said there were instances of "terror" by anti-Turk elements during the campaign and election which early results indicate was won by the Bulgarian Socialist Party, the former Communist Party.

Several thousand supporters of the liberal opposition demonstrated in Sofia Monday claiming the election was rigged, but international observers said they found no irregularities.

In Dobrudzha and Deli Orman [Ludogorie] in Bulgaria, with a largely ethnic Turk population, the Socialist Party and two or three other groups led an "anti-Turk campaign," Mr. Cavus said. He added that Turkish candidates were not allowed to use their Turkish names, weakening their chances in the election with the Turkish minority.

The assimilation policy under the regime of communist leader Todor Zhivkov denied ethnic Turks the right to use their Turkish names, and sparked an exodus of 340,000 ethnic Turks from Bulgaria.

Mr. Cavus said the 140,000 Turks who returned to Bulgaria after Mr. Zhivkov's fall were not allowed to vote in the election "under the pretext that they had asked for a tourist visa."

The Turkish community in Bulgaria, represented in the Bulgarian parliament for 45 years, has never had more than eight deputies in parliament, Mr. Cavus said. However, Mr. Cavus predicted that after the second round the Turkish minority would have "around 30 to 35 deputies elected," and he said that number would climb to 45 in the scheduled 1992 elections.

Estimates by the West German opinion poll institute INFAS credited the Bulgarian Socialist Party (former Communist Party) with 47.2 percent of the vote and the Union of Democratic Forces with 36.2 percent.

Another round of voting is to be held next week.

Havel, Parties Agree To Name Calfa Premier

LD1206122190 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1200 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Vaclav Havel, president of the Republic, today opened first political talks with the two parties that emerged strongest from the free elections: Civic Forum and the Public Against Violence. All participants in the talks agreed that Marian Calfa will be entrusted with forming the new government.

Calfa Says Some Government Tasks Fulfilled

LD0906013290 Prague CTK in English 1944 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 8 (CTK)—The first task of the national understanding government—to ensure free elections—has been fulfilled. Czechoslovak Premier Marian Calfa told CTK here today [8 June] after casting his vote in the parliamentary elections.

The results achieved can be used in the program declaration of the new government which will be created after the election of the new parliament, the Czechoslovak premier stressed, and voiced the conviction that the task to prove that there exists in central Europe a state called Czechoslovakia with a good quality has also been fulfilled.

Communist Leaders View Future Role

LD1006105490 Prague Television Service in Czech 2000 GMT 09 Jun 90

[Interview with Communist Party representatives by unidentified reporters; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] I am sitting here with, so far, the third-largest party, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. According to the preliminary results, your seats are secured in the parliament but there is another problem and that is that according to the indications, which we have been able to hear and which have also emerged by courtesy of the CTK, practically no other party or movement wants to enter into a coalition with you. How are you going to tackle this and how do you view it?

[(?Mohorita)] I believe that we have made it unequivocally clear that we are ready to cooperate with anyone. If no one is interested in such cooperation, this is another question. We will then go into opposition but not into a cheap one. We will go into a constructive and positive opposition, and we will then see if you change your view when the others finally understand that in essence we are a totally new party, genuinely interested in having a pluralistic system.

[Reporter] What is a positive opposition?

[(?Mohorita)] This means that we will not criticize shortcomings alone. This we can do, and we have learned how nice it is to criticize for 40 years. We will, however, come forward with positive proposals about how we think some questions should be tackled. We will also work actively and honestly because without the honest work of our voters, no market economy, no mechanism will work and function.

[Reporter] Mr. Petr Weiss [head of the Slovak Communist Party], how do you see your role in the parliament, especially in the Slovak one. We have already seen what the Slovak National Council will look like. How are you going to influence the shaping of the laws?

[Weiss] In view of the predicted composition of the political forces in the Slovak National Council, we will apparently find ourselves in the role of a constructive opposition.

[Reporter] You are, therefore, not envisioning entering a coalition?

[Weiss] In view of the statements made by the strongest parties, which we were able to hear about an hour and a half ago, I do not at present envision such a development. In any case, we will have something to say not only on the solution of economic problems and social policy issues, but also on issues concerning the real equality between the Czechs and the Slovaks. We will strive to ensure that the federation does not disguise any longer and in any form an unequal status of any of the two nations. Precisely because we want to live together with the Czechs, we say that the federation must not be a cloak that covers up forms of unequality.

[Reporter] What will your attitude be to market mechanism or market economy, which in essence runs counter to your ideology?

[Weiss] I do not think that this runs counter to our ideology, because our ideology has been explained up to now in accordance with certain old notions and stereotypes as they were disseminated in in evening universities of Marxism-Leninism, and I believe that this is already behind us, behind the party. We have spoken clearly about this issue in our program.

[Reporter] The last brief question: Do you count on a seat in the government?

[Weiss] In view of what I have said, it is difficult to talk about it at present. One cannot however exclude a possibility that there will be an interest in an outstanding expert.

CSL Official Assaulted; Complaint Lodged

AU1006185990

[Editorial Report] Prague LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE in Czech on 1 June on page 4, under the headline "A Skirmish on Revolucni," carries a 150-word "(MD)"-signed report on a "regrettable incident" which took

place on 31 May outside the Czechoslovak People's Party (CSL) Central Political Office on Revolucni Street in Prague.

According to the report, a group of youths began posting campaign placards supporting the Movement for Civil Liberties (HOS) over CSL and Christian Democratic Union placards. When party representatives tried to intervene, the HOS supporters assaulted F. Sejnost, CSL deputy general secretary, pulling him along the street and ripping his tie.

Prague LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE in Czech on 2 June on pages 1 and 4, under the headline "A Complaint Submitted to the Czech Republic Interior Minister," carries a 350-word letter addressed to the Czech Republic interior minister by Dr. Jiri Cerny, CSL general secretary, in which he complains about the action taken by the police after the Revolucni Street incident.

According to Cerny, the police did not conduct "the necessary investigation, did not gather the necessary evidence, did not question witnesses, and did not write a protocol." He protests against this course of action, claiming that it is "a violation of the Public Security Corps' duty," and against the "absence of protection for the rights of political parties in the election campaign."

Finance Minister Outlines Planned Reforms

LD0906200590 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] Minister Vaclav Klaus gave a news conference at the Federal Ministry of Finance in Prague at which he briefed domestic and foreign journalists about reform steps that are planned and about the financial policy of the Government of National Accord. Barbora Tacheci reports in more detail:

[Tacheci] Minister Klaus said that that afternoon a document is to be finished summing up the specific steps of privatization of our economy. It will be sent to the government next week.

As Minister Klaus stressed, the main problem is not the privatization of small and middle-scale entreprises that are under the management of national committees but the privatization of those notorious giants of our national economy. It is because there is not enough home capital in Czechoslovakia to privatize them. That is why Minister Klaus keeps pushing through—as one possible variant—the idea of freely giving to our population so-called property investment bonds.

Minister Klaus went on to speak, among other things, about the relationship between the Federal Ministry of Finances and the Ministries of Finances, Prices and Wages of the two republics. He admitted that in the process of pushing through the transfer of powers and authority to the bodies of the two republics, all three ministries have their own distinctive concepts of future budget regulations and that there are substantial differences between them. Nevertheless, the question of the transfer of money from the federal budget to the budgets of the two republics is different from the question of the need to have a unified financial and budget policy managed from the center for the entire Czechoslovak Republic.

Answering a question whether the subsidy for miners' wages, which was approved by the government in the last few days, is not contradicting the severely restrictive financial policy, Minister Klaus said that this is not a subsidy that does not need to be repaid but a loan that is to be repaid by June next year. The minister did not say by whom.

Speaking about Czechoslovakia's attitude toward foreign financial aid, Minister Klaus said that our concept is different from those of other East European countries. We are more interested in the aid on the macroeconomic level in creating a certain reserve for overcoming the period of liberalization of prices and hard-currency exchange rates than in so-called politically neutral financial injections given in the course of a reform. Specific financial aid should come though only after the reform of our economy is finished—and it should come from the European Bank for the Reconstruction and Development, a branch of which will be founded also in Prague.

Allegations Against People's Party's Bartoncik

People's Party Issues Statement

LD0806195290 Prague CTK in English 1631 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 8 (CTK)—The information published by the general prosecution of the Czech Republic today [8 June] creates the impression that the Czechoslovak People's Party had enough reasons to to adopt a significant decision and withdraw the candidature of its Chairman Josef Bartoncik from the list of candidates to the House of the People of the Federal Assembly, said a statement published today by the Czechoslovak People's Party leadership.

Neither the general prosecution nor the president of Czechoslovakia have contacted other representatives of the People's Party to inform them about the material handed over by the general prosecution to the Czechoslovak president on June 5 and discuss it with them. Instead, Czech Prosecutor General Dr. Rychetsky informed Ludvik Motycka, presidium member of the Czechoslovak People's Party, during an accidental meeting of a material containing facts in consequence of which Josef Bartoncik should withdraw from political life. The material allegedly includes accusations similar to those which have been published by the Austrian magazine PROFIL and a testimony of a member of the former State Security Corps. The leadership of the Czechoslovak People's Party received the information on June 6 around 1500 GMT and after consultations refused to accept this pressure. The party leadership

stresses that this procedure has all signs of blackmail. It is regrettable that the prosecutor-general of the Czech Republic was involved in it, the statement said.

CTK contacted today Czech General Prosecutor Pavel Rychetsky who said that in view of the current elections, the commitment to observe professional secrecy he must not comment on it. "I would welcome the removal of these obstacles so that the public can learn the truth," the Czech prosecutor-general said.

Hanak To View Case After Elections

LD0906014190 Prague CTK in English 1953 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 8 (CTK)—The Czechoslovak People's Party leadership today [8 June] said it is in a situation in which it can take no decision on its chairman Josef Bartoncik's case.

The leadership said that on the basis of its today's talks with representatives of the Civic Forum Coordinating Centre it displayed maximum effort to get acquainted with the material which allegedly disqualifies Josef Bartoncik from running in the current parliamentary elections. However, Czechoslovak Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml, who keeps it, said that he will hand it over only to a court or the Prosecutor's Office.

Afterwards, the party's leadership sought reception by Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel but his adviser Jiri Krizan told the party's first deputy chairman, Stanislav Hanak, that he has been entrusted to personally discuss the case and that he is ready to receive a delegation of the People's Party leadership only after the elections, i.e. after the planned press conference at 12.00 GMT tomorrow [9 June].

Havel Remarks on Candidacy

LD0906020590 Prague CTK in English 1828 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 8 (CTK)—Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel today [8 June] conveyed a statement to CTK saying that Josef Bartoncik, Czechoslovak People's Party chairman, deputy chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly and chairman of the Assembly's House of the People, has failed to keep his promise made at their recent meeting.

(Josef Bartoncik has not withdrawn his candidature for the House of the People which he had allegedly promised to Czechoslovak Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml when certain thus far unpublished material was found disqualifying J. Bartoncik to be active as a parliament deputy. Since he did not withdraw, Jan Ruml labelled him as an unprincipled person trying to the last moment to conceal his past. In May, the Austrian magazine PROFIL wrote that Bartoncik had allegedly cooperated with the former secret police [CTB]).

In his statement, Vaclav Havel said that he discussed with Josef Bartoncik (he visited him in hospital on June 5 where Bartoncik was taken earlier in the day for a heart ailment) various aspects of the political situation in Czechoslovakia and other questions.

The president wrote he cannot say more since he promised Josef Bartoncik not to speak about their discussion, but added that J. Bartoncik himself had failed to keep a certain promise he made during the meeting. Present at the discussion was the president's adviser Jiri Krizan who will give evidence on the matter at 12.00 GMT tomorrow.

Vaclav Havel stressed that Deputy Federal Interior Minister Jan Ruml enjoys his full confidence as he is impartial and honest. The same is true of Czech prosecutor General Pavel Rychetsk.

The president added in the statement that his conduct is motivated by his promise to guarantee free elections and to protect the ethic of democratic changes in the country.

Civic Forum Urges Discussion

LD0906013490 Prague CTK in English 1941 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 8 (CTK)—The Civic Forum Coordinating Centre today [8 June] conveyed to CTK a statement urging a meeting of the parties involved in the affair around Czechoslovak People's Party Chairman and Federal Assembly Deputy Chairman Josef Bartoncik to be held quickly to discuss the dispute.

The statement said that talks should be held between Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel, the federal Interior Ministry, the Czech Prosecutor General's Office and the leadership of the Czechoslovak People's Party in order not to allow challenging the credibility of the current parliamentary elections, the first free ones in Czechoslovakia since 1946.

That is why Civic Forum Coordinating Centre representatives today initiated talks with Czechoslovak People's Party representatives at which they protested against linking the Civic Forum with the affair. It became evident during the discussion that the party leadership acted on the basis of incomplete information, and therefore the Civic Forum proposed that the Czechoslovak People's Party leadership quickly arrange personal talks with President Havel.

The Civic Forum Coordinating Centre insists that the whole affair be wound up in a legal way and in peace before the new Federal Assembly which will emerge from the current elections starts its activity.

President's Adviser Comments

LD1006082890 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1200 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Statement by presidential adviser Jiri Krizan at a news conference at Prague Castle—live]

[Text] The talk I am going to refer to took place during the afternoon of 5 June. In a talk with the president and me, Dr. Bartoncik was told that irrefutable proof exists that he had collaborated with the State Security Police. For 17 years he had been a paid agent of the State Security. He was told that he had two options: Either he should make an immediate public statement and absolutely refute this allegation or else he should immediately retire from political life and withdraw his candidacy in the elections. He chose the second option, and unambiguously promised—repeating the promise at least twice—that by the evening he would withdraw his candidacy in the elections. Approximately three hours after that talk, I learned from the Secretariat of the People's Party that Dr. Bartoncik had suddenly been taken ill and was in the resuscitation unit of Prague clinic No. 3. The next day it was announced that his state of health was good. He had not withdrawn his candidacy in the elections, and he thus broke his promise. Therefore, neither the president nor I feel bound by the promise we made to him that we would not discuss the content of our talk.

I consider it right that Federal Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml made the whole affair public. His conduct was clearly motivated by the endeavor to save the elections from dirty tricks and from being undermined. The accusation that Mr. Ruml wanted to influence the elections is absurd—he is not a member of any political party nor any political movement. For months he has shown his impartiality in his newspaper articles, in which he has made sharp criticism, whenever he considered it right, of any party or movement, be it the Communists, Socialists, People's Party, or Civic Forum. The sole culprit worthy of condemnation in this affair is Dr. Bartoncik, whose conduct and attitudes cannot be described as anything other than unprincipled, and I consider his mandate in the new Federal Assembly as being unacceptable.

Let me wind up by saying that if we take President Tomas Garrigue Masaryk as our example, and if we want to follow his principle of living in truth, then we must speak the truth and show the truth. No excuses on the grounds of so-called public interest that the truth should be concealed, if only temporarily, can have any moral foundation. Thank you.

Letter Read at News Conference

LD1006082190 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1200 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Undated letter from People's Party Chairman Josef Bartoncik, read by presidential adviser Jiri Krizan at a news conference at Prague Castle—live]

[Text] Exactly an hour ago, Dr. Bartoncik's secretary delivered a letter to me, which I am going to read you now at the request of Dr. Bartoncik. I apologize if I falter a little, because the handwriting is a little difficult to read in places.

Dear Dr. Krizan,

While in the hospital, I read that you are to make a statement on our talk with the president, which was supposed to remain confidential. After everything that has happened while I have been lying in the coronary unit in the hospital, I do not believe anyone or anything. However, I wish to ensure that the conclusions of our talk at the castle are conveyed reliably, in the following manner. First: I reject the denunciation by someone called Mr. Machety in its entirety. I have done this point by point.

Second: Because there is no opportunity to refute these allegations at the present time, I will resolve the issue of my public posts by this evening, because it is not tolerable for me to hold two important posts—a public and a party one [Federal Assembly deputy chairman and Czechoslovak People's Party chairman]. I do not want to undermine the democracy that I have helped to build. There was no mention of my retiring from public life.

Third: After the elections, I will ask for the affair to be investigated—it is a provocation.

Fourth: We agreed with the president that a report would be issued on the content of our talks to the effect that we discussed the situation in the country after the elections.

Mr. Krizan, everything that I could have done before I was taken ill, I did. What has happened during my illness is a disgrace worthy of a totalitarian regime at the height of its power. I will leave it to others to judge the legal conduct of the deputy interior minister and general prosecutor—even a first-year student at a faculty of law could judge it. To rely on the testimony of a member of the State Security Police, which we recently both described as a criminal organization, is really something! I apologize, but I am writing this secretly at the coronary unit in the hospital. I insist that my statement be made public together with yours. The truth will prevail—or will it?

Ruml Explains TV Statement

LD1006084490 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1200 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Statement by Deputy Federal Interior Minister Jan Ruml at a news conference at Prague Castle—live]

[Excerpt] As I am aware that the situation concerning Dr. Josef Bartoncik during the last week has been rather confused, I prepared the following time survey of the events.

On 4 June, I received information from the Brno register of documents, which testified to the fact that the State Security kept a file on Dr. Bartoncik for 17 years, from 1971 to 1988, as its secret collaborator. I informed my superior, Dr. Richard Sacher, federal minister of interior, and also the president of the republic about this fact without delay.

On Tuesday, 5 June, a former State Secret Police [StB] member was interrogated by the General Prosecutor's

Office, and he testified that for five years he had been Dr. Bartoncik's controller and used to give him tasks that Mr. Bartoncik was to fulfill in the South Moravian region among the members of the Czechoslovak People's Party. The prosecutor general briefed the president of the republic about this testimony without delay, and Vaclav Havel, at the presence of his adviser, Jiri Krizan, met Dr. Bartoncik on Tuesday afternoon. Dr. Bartoncik promised to him during their talks that he would leave political life the same evening, resigning his candidacy and abstaining from other public appearances. Nevertheless, he did not keep his promise.

That is why I was asked by the president of the republic, on Wednesday, around noon, to inform Dr. Richard Sacher, as a member of the Presidium of the Czechoslovak People's Party, that Dr. Bartoncik gave this promise to the president and that the President insisted it was fulfilled. At 1245, I informed Dr. Sacher about these facts and told him that there was evidence about Dr. Bartoncik's long-term collaboration with the State Security. I told him that he must be aware from the extract from a register of documents that Mr. Bartoncik was registered as an StB agent and that the Czechoslovak People's Party should have removed him from its ballot list—as was done in other similar cases. I also drew his attention to a strange fact that screening did not reveal this part of Dr. Bartoncik's past. I also pointed out to him that time was passing and the ballot list had to assume its final form by 1400. My intention was—and I said so—to avoid acquainting the public with the entire affair because it could cause election damage to the party.

Around 1600, I spoke with Dr. Sacher by phone, and he told that he had visited Dr. Bartoncik in the hospital and that Dr. Bartoncik did not intend to give up his candidacy. The idea that Dr. Bartoncik could become even a chairman of the parliament, and that in such a case the president of the republic would be sworn in by the person who for 17 years kept deceiving people who worked with him and informed on them, was so unacceptable for me that I issued a statement on television.

By making this statement, I did not intend at all to damage the Czechoslovak People's Party, and I repeat once more that I did everything I could to prevent the necessity of discussing Dr. Bartoncik's past publicly. [passage omitted: Ruml on his respect for the Czechoslovak People's Party]

Rychetsky Discusses 'Scandal'

LD1006085290 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1200 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Statement by Pavel Rychetsky, general prosecutor of the Czech Republic, at a news conference at Prague Castle—live]

[Excerpts] Ladies and gentlemen, last Monday evening the secretary of the Federal Assembly's Defense and Security committee notified me that a member of the former State Secret Police [StB] had been asking to be heard for several days, and to testify in the case of Dr. Bartoncik to the relevant committees of the Federal Assembly. The Federal Assembly, in the persons of its deputies and the abovementioned secretary, however, insisted that in order to ensure that the testimony was reliable, and made in keeping with the relevant legal provisions, in other words, under the sanction of possible proceedings for the crime of perjury, slander, or the crime of infringing the rights of others, it had to be given in the appropriate place, that is to say, before the prosecutor. In view of the fact that he was a member of the National Security Corps [SNB], I ensured that he was relieved of his duty of silence under the Official Secrets Act, and the hearing began on Tuesday at 0930. At that time, of course, I did not know what the subject of the testimony would be. The testimony, I am told, ended at 1230, and the protocol that I am going to quote to you unfortunately substantiated facts concerning Dr. Bartoncik and his collaboration with the StB.

After evaluating the testimony, I reached the conclusion that in respect of Dr. Bartoncik, there was no suspicion of a crime in view of the presidential amnesty declared on 1 January, but nonetheless, the content of the testimony was so grave that I was obliged to notify the relevant constitutional officials. Since Mr. Bartoncik is deputy chairman of the Federal Assembly, and since Federal Assembly Chairman Mr. Alexander Dubcek was away from Prague, I visited the President's Chancellery and briefed the president. At the same time, I drew his attention to the fact that, regardless of the fact that the testimony had been given according to the legal regulations, the veracity of the facts had to be checked. Unfortunately, the facts were substantiated, as you have heard, both in Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml's statement and also in Mr. Krizan's statement, from which it emerges that Mr. Bartoncik did not deny collaboration over a longer period with the StB; therefore as far as the General Prosecutor's Department is concerned, I considered the affair closed, and only that evening was I informed by Presidential Adviser Mr Krizan that there had been a talk between the president and Mr. Bartoncik, at which certain agreement was reached enabling the politically intolerable situation that had arisen to be resolved without any scandal or public knowledge.

The next day I attended a session of the Czech Government, during the course of which I was told several times that the promise made to the president had not been kept on the party of Mr. Bartoncik, and a statement was expected from the Czechoslovak People's Party with whom—or with Mr. Sacher, one of its officials, as you have heard—persons other than I were subsequently in contact. When I learned that the Czechoslovak People's Party had not taken the necessary steps either, I considered it my duty—not, in this case, as general prosecutor—to try to prevent what subsequently happened, and particularly what is happening now, when, under the gaze of the whole country and even the whole world, we

are obliged to speak about one of the citizens of our country in a way which is unpleasant. I had hoped that I would manage to convince Deputy Minister Ruml—assuming that the People's Party took the necessary steps—that the whole affair would not have to become a scandal. By this I mean that of course, as far as Mr. Ruml's statement is concerned, I consider it absolutely irreproachable on moral grounds, and I agree with it, but I had hoped that the whole affair could be resolved in the same way as similar matters in the recent past, in respect of other officials, including constitutional ones.

[passage omitted on quotes from the protocol of the testimony given on 5 June]

I would like to cite some facts about the activity of Mr. Bartoncik as an StB agent. During his period of collaboration with the StB, Mr. Bartoncik used the code name Hajek, registration number 15301. He was a secret agent, one of the best collaborators, and as such was remunerated by the StB. I have seen Mr. Bartoncik's file many times. It contained a number of specific reports written in his own hand, in which he drew attention to unsuitable or antisocial activity by specific persons, called for them to be sanctioned—for example by dismissing them from their jobs, demotion, and so forth. This file also contained a promise of cooperation, written in his own hand, but that was subsequently—although before 17 November 1989—removed from the file. [passage omitted on details of Bartoncik's StB controllers in Brno]

Mr. Bartoncik's file also says that he was a secret collaborator for many years, and his importance for the StB grew considerably in recent years. He was controlled directly by the head of the StB's second directorate, and his reports were received directly by Milos Jakes and Alois Indra. The plans for Bartoncik's work as an agent in recent years were no longer handled by a senior officer, but directly by the head of the StB—I will not name him. The information for Jakes and Indra was not processed by me nor by the head of my department, but directly by the deputy head of the StB's second directorate, Major—I will not name him. [passage omitted on more details about Bartoncik's activities from 1987—infiltrated church groups connected with charter 77; sent reports on their activities to his StB controllers]

I do not want to quote anything more from this protocol, even though yesterday evening I was relieved by the chairman of the Czech National Council of my duties of silence under official secrecy commitments, because I feel that they are not crucial. What is crucial is that before this information was conveyed to the president in any form, it was checked at the level of the Federal Ministry of the Interior, and it is also crucial that Mr. Bartoncik, as Mr. Krizan has told us, did not deny these facts. Thank you for your attention.

Bartoncik Called 'Paid Agent'

LD0906195590 Prague CTK in English 1806 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 9 (CTK)—Czechoslovak presidential adviser Jiri Krizan told a press conference here today [9 June] that chairman of the Czechoslovak People's Party Josef Bartoncik, deputy chairman of the Federal Assembly (Parliament) and chairman of its House of the People was a paid agent of the former secret police (STB) for 17 years.

The conference was convened for 1200 GMT, i.e. the moment when the two-day parliamentary elections in Czechoslovakia ended, in order not to influence the course of the elections by the revelation about the leader of the People's Party (of Christian Democratic orientation), one of the parties running in the elections.

The president's adviser told journalists about the meeting between Vaclav Havel and Josef Bartoncik on June 5 at which Josef Bartoncik was presented evidence on his activity to the benefit of the secret police in the years 1971-1988. He was asked by the president to withdraw from political life. Josef Bartoncik promised to give up his candidature, but he did not live up to his promise, and instead the party's secretariat announced that he had been hospitalized.

The press conference heard a letter written by Josef Bartoncik in hospital today in which he rejects the accusation, and states that he will propose criminal prosecution after release from hospital, describing the whole thing as provocation.

Czechoslovak Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml and Czech Prosecutor General Pavel Rychetsky presented convincing evidence on Mr. Bartoncik's services for the secret police of the past regime. He was its informer among the People's Party membership in South Moravia.

According to an interrogation of a former STB member, conducted by the prosecution, Bartoncik's importance for the secret police was rising especially in the past few years when his reports were destined right for former Czechoslovak Communist Party General Secretary Milos Jakes and Czechoslovak Federal Assembly Chairman Alois Indra.

People's Party Officials on Case

LD0906222390 Prague CTK in English 2024 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 9 (CTK)—"The Czechoslovak People's Party has not until today's press conference been informed about the evidence against Josef Bartoncik and could not thus adopt any measure. The Czechoslovak People's Party Presidium will meet for a session tomorrow," Czechoslovak People's Party Deputy Chairman Bohumil Svoboda told a press conference here Saturday [9 June].

Party's General Secretary Jiri Cerny added that participants in today's press conference on the case "Bartoncik" in Prague Castle did not submit any evidence, just assertions.

"If Mr. Bartoncik is proved to have been a secret police collaborator, and the possibility of misinformation is excluded, I will be the first to recommend the Czechoslovak People's Party to get rid of this member," the party's Presidium member and Czechoslovak Minister of the Interior Richard Sacher stressed.

"The only written proof presented to me by Deputy Minister Jan Ruml is not relevant," Richard Sacher said, adding it does not prove Mr. Bartoncik's paid service for the secret police.

Richard Sacher further said he met with President Havel shortly before his departure for Moscow. Approximately an hour later he visited Josef Bartoncik in the hospital who denied everything contained in the interrogation protocol of a former secret police member conducted by the prosecution.

Answering the question why he did not inform the Czechoslovak People's Party leadership about the existence of the evidence against Dr Bartoncik, Richard Sacher said he is under a vow of silence even towards his own party.

He also stated that the struggle for the Ministry of the Interior continues in the same extent, and added that articles discrediting his person are to be published in the nearest future.

A representative of the Austrian periodical "PROFIL" denied the information that the magazine intends to publish an apology to Josef Bartoncik.

Uhl on Collaborator Identifications

LD1006210790 Prague CTK in English 1653 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Prague June 10 (CTK)—Member of the Committee for the Protection of Unjustly Persecuted [VONS] Petr Uhl today stressed that according to documents available it is possible to safely establish any person who collaborated with the former secret police (STB).

He was reacting to the statement at a briefing of the "Public Against Violence" (VPN) last night by VPN representative Miroslav Kusy that "materials of the former STB can be confusing and distorting... even persons who did not know it could be included in the STB evidence which could contain the names of opponents to the regime who were persecuted by it. Listed in the evidence could be even people who formally pledged to collaborate, but in fact never collaborated and harmed no one."

In fact, a majority of the people registered by the secret police did not know it. There existed so called signal files, files of suspected persons and files of dangerous persons. All famous opponents to the regime were naturally registered, but in a different file, and it is possible to distinguish at first sight secret collaborators from the other registered persons. Confusion is impossible, Petr Uhl said.

Czechoslovak Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml said at a press conference on June 9: "Screening...cannot secure that every agent will be exposed, but it can be safely established that he who has been exposed as an agent is really one," Petr Uhl stressed.

The degree of guilt of a secret collaborator, including cases when there was no (or minimum) collaboration, can be determined especially by studying the files if they were not destroyed, interrogation of the command persons, superiors, and possibly in other ways, the VONS member said.

Jan Budaj Withdraws Council Candidacy

LD1006093190 Prague CTK in English 2237 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Bratislava June 9 (CTK)—Slovak National Council Deputy Chairman Jan Budaj announced today he withdraws from his candidature to the Slovak National Council.

At a post-election briefing of the Public Against Violence coordinating centre here tonight he said he was registered as one of former secret police (STB) collaborators. He spoke about his struggle with the communist power and the pressure exerted on his person by the STB after his attempt to emigrate in the 1970's. He was told he would never obtain a passport, only in case he signs cooperation with the secret police. However, he stressed he had actually never collaborated with STB. "My withdrawal is not motivated with the feeling of guilt, it is not a protest against those who screened the candidates of the Public against Violence", he said in the end.

Party Officials on Resignation

LD1006154690 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1030 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Excerpts] The greatest attention at a post-election news conference, which took place in the Public Against Violence coordinating center in Bratislava yesterday evening, was attracted by several statements, but above all by Jan Budaj's statement. He—as already announced—resigned his candidacy for the Slovak National Council. [passage omitted]

In this context we interviewed representatives of political parties and movements which, according to a forecast of the election results, gained most votes. Editor Ivan Kosec interviewed Fedor Gal, chairman of the coordinating center of the Public Against Violence:

"[Kosec] Mr. Gal, how do you assess the events concerning Jan Budaj?

"[Gal] I think it will take many years before we will fully understand under what conditions we in fact lived, how we lived. When the Public Against Violence movement made the decision to screen its candidates, the purpose of the screening was honest and clean: To ensure the voters that they could rely on not having their representatives vulnerable to blackmail. Since receiving the results of the screening I have personally gone through the most difficult moments of my life—I was confronted with people's fates, dramas, with people I consider to be StB [State Secret Police] victims, more than anything else. These are people who are included—in strange ways and often even without knowing about it—in the files and documents which we know are incompatible, which we know are nowadays held by people in whose hands they should not be, which we know to be written by members of what we nowadays call the dark forces.

"Nevertheless, there was a principle and agreement adopted by the council of the Public Against Violence, as well as candidates themselves, according to which a negative result of screening meant resigning from the ballot list of the Public Against Violence. And we observed this principle, this agreement. We observed them despite the fact that before us there were totally trustworthy people. I have known Jan Budaj for long time; he has normal human faults but I do not doubt one of his character feature: His honesty and devotion to the cause. I like him and respect him. [passage omitted]

"Jan Budaj, in a certain period of his life, in the period which I call his guerilla war with the State Security, signed a document on collaboration in order to be able to continue his contacts with his Polish friends, distribution and production of samizdats, and so on. This document exists. What does not exist is his collaboration with the StB. The only proof that what I believe and what I am saying now is true would be publication of the Jan Budaj file; but this file does not exist. Somebody took it from the StB files in March. Somebody obviously counted on Jan Budaj becoming an important political personality in Slovakia, and on the fact that then it would be possible for him to gain something from the information he illegally acquired. [passage omitted]"

The Christian Democratic Movement will probably, according to a forecast, become the second strongest party in Slovakia. That is why editor Alica Bielikova interviewed Ivan Carnogursky.

"[Carnogursky] [passage omitted] I can confirm that Mr. Budaj is among the people who deserve to be trusted.

"[Bielikova] Would Mr. Jan Budaj, in your view, be fit to be a deputy?

"[Carnogursky] He certainly would, because there are not many such deputies as Mr. Budaj."

That was Ivan Carnogursky from the Christian Democratic Movement speaking. Everything shows that the Slovak National Party is to become the third strongest political party in Slovakia. Igor Matlon interviewed Stanislav (Panys), member of its central council:

"[Matlon] What stance did the Slovak National Party take regarding a Czechoslovak Press Agency report on the case of Jan Budaj?

"[(Panys)] The fact is that if the nation knew that Jan Budaj was an StB member, then the results of the elections would be totally different. The Slovaks were deceived in the elections by not having enough information available. In fact, the Public Against Violence gained votes which the Slovaks would not have given to them if they had known this—and our party would certainly have gained more. [passage omitted]"

We conclude with an interview with Dusan Dorotin, member of the Executive Committee of the Slovak Communist Party, given to our editor Sona Jesenska:

"[Jesenska] [passage omitted]

"[Dorotin] [passage omitted] I think that Mr. Budaj's understanding the explanation of the problem expresses an honest attitude, as he openly spoke about his past and his attitude toward the future. As far as his prospects are concerned I think that given his activites after 17 November we should look at it in the way that we should not reject people forever only because of their acts in the past, but that we should consider this problem in its entirety and in a human way.

"[Jesenska] Your Communist Party has not submitted itself to screening. Could you tell us why?

"[Dorotin] The decision that the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] members running for deputies were not to be screened was taken by the CPCZ Central Committee. The CPSL Central Committee, its Executive Committee, expressed the view that such screening was necessary. [passage omitted]"

Budaj on StB Collaboration

LD1006173190 Prague CTK in English 1552 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Bratislava June 10 (CTK)—Jan Budaj, deputy chairman of the Slovak National Council, who withdrew his candidature to the Slovak National Council for having been registered as a secret police (STB) collaborator, said at a Public Against Violence (VPN) movement briefing here today that he had never denounced anybody.

Budaj's collaboration with the former secret police was proved during screening of VPN's candidates for the June 8-9 parliamentary elections.

He said at the briefing today that he established cooperation with the STB in order to get a travel passport. Afterwards he emigrated, but soon returned back home.

"Immediately after return, I resisted cooperation with the STB and announced that I am terminating the earlier promised cooperation. I did not know that STB registered me on the list of its collaborators."

Philosopher Milan Simecka said he had understanding for Buday's conduct, and appreciated his years-long activity in opposition structures.

Journalists were also acquainted with a VPN statement saying, inter alia, that the materials of the former STB can be confusing and distorting.

Stepan To Be Tried 'Behind Closed Doors'

AU1006190490 Prague SVOBODNE SLOVO in Czech 2 Jun 90 p 3

["(nek)"-signed report: "Behind Closed Doors"]

[Text] Prague—Defendant Engineer M. Stepan will be tried in the District Court in Prague 1 by tribunal of judges chairman M. Markova, LL.D. "I learned about this on Thursday [31 May]; I will be studying the file starting on Monday [4 June]. The trial should take place as soon as possible, but I will have to demand that custody be extended, since the file cannot be examined in a few days." What surprises me is that the trial will be held in camera. No journalists or members of the public will be allowed to be present in the courtroom. "Only when the verdict is passed...," J. Novak, LL.D, court chairman for Prague 1, said to us yesterday. "The Czech Republic Prosecutor General is not prepared to lift the secret nature of the trial." M. Stepan is the first representative of the totalitarian regime in twenty years to stand trial. If the public is not properly informed, then it will be said that many things are being kept under wraps again.

News Conference on Former Officials' Prosecution

AU1006191390 Bratislava VEREJNOST in Slovak 2 Jun 90 p 2

["(YVA)"-signed report: "A Criminal Prosecution"]

[Text] No suggestion made by our citizens—who, after 17 November, pointed out that the becoming rich and other antisocial activity of the then party and government officials—will go unnoticed. This was stated at yesterday's news conference by representatives of the Slovak Republic Ministry of the Interior. Lieutenant Colonel Stefan Lastovka voiced his opinion about the criminal activity of the former Slovak Television directors, Milos Marek and Jaroslav Hlinicky, who lent—and replaced—various equipment, for example television sets, to the most senior representatives of the Communist Party of Slovakia and of the government. The names signed on the agreements read as follows: J. Lenart, V. Salgovic, P. Lomen, G. Slapka, V. Bilak, M. Hruskovic, A. Kopso, and others. The former director of Agrostav Liptovsky Hradok—who billed a former Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee secretary for construction work on his home 123,000 korunas less then he should have—has also been criminally prosecuted. Criminal prosecution has also been initiated against Jan Piescak, former Slovak Republic prosecutor general, for covering up the criminal acts committed by party, state, and administrative officials connected with the Babinsky case. The public will be informed about all other persons whose names cannot be published in order to respect the presumption of innocence.

Diplomatic Relations Established With Namibia

LD1206075290 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 0400 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Czechoslovakia and Namibia established diplomatic relations at the level of ambassadors on 11 June. The protocol was signed for the Czechoslovak side in the Namibian capital by Deputy Foreign Minister Vera Bartoskova.

Military Alliances' New Situation Viewed

AU1006063490 Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY in Slovak 5 Jun 90 p 4

["(SD)"-signed commentary: "A New Situation and a New Strategy"]

[Text] Recently, one of the most senior NATO representatives admitted for the first time that there is no threat from the East and that NATO no longer fears an attack from the Warsaw Pact. Obviously, in view of the new situation in Central and East Europe, the North Atlantic alliance is altering its strategy. Does this turnaround mean that NATO no longer attaches the same significance to the Warsaw Pact as it did previously?

A surprising outcome of the recent upheavals is the apparent agreement to maintain the Warsaw Pact alongside the North Atlantic alliance, at least until some other security system is established. In essence, Moscow claims that its aim is the dissolution of both blocs. However, recently the tone has changed a little in favor of maintaining the pacts temporarily for the sake of stability. Speculation about the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact also alarms the United States. The Americans are very aware of the fact that this would also weaken the North Atlantic alliance and that a more independent Europe would gravely complicate American influence on the old continent. If the Warsaw Pact were to dissolve itself unilaterally, this would certainly cause major problems for NATO because the North Atlantic alliance would find it more difficult to justify its existence. The majority of strategists agree that both pacts should be maintained so that a power vacuum is not created in Europe.

However, the question still remains: In what form? It is without doubt that both alliances will have to fundamentally alter themselves. They should become less military and more political. Politicization would considerably increase the stability of both pacts and would establish

prerequisites for expanding cooperation among their members in the spheres vitally important to their interests.

NATO will have to take the unification of Germany into consideration as well as the reduction of the Soviet military threat. The Warsaw Pact can only survive if it manages to change into an organization of equal states and into a more mature political union founded on the actual, and not the formal, equality of its members. It must reject the Stalinist heritage in relations between the Soviet Union and East Europe. The USSR has to decisively renounce its paternalistic attitude toward the East European countries and must distance itself from those events of the past which placed these states in the position of satellites and not of allies.

Of key importance for the further development of the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact, however, will be the answer to the question on which direction the unified Germany will take. So far, each side has adopted a different point of view. Gerhard Stoltenberg, West German defense minister, has rejected the Soviet proposal that the unified Germany should be like France, that is, a member of the political but not of the military part of the North Atlantic alliance. The Federal Republic of Germany and its allies insist that the entire unified Germany should be a member of the Western alliance. However, the Soviet Union considers the GDR's move into the opposite camp to be a violation of stability and balance in Europe and is against it. To date, it has proposed Germany's neutrality or its joint membership in both pacts. The West has rejected the first as well as the second proposal, but, so far, has not come up with any other version.

Nor did it come up with another proposal at the Washington summit and, thus, this issue still remains open. Obviously, we will have to wait until the forthcoming summit meetings between both alliances for the appropriate answer.

GERMAN REUNIFICATION

Notice to Readers: *Reportage on German reunification may also be found in the Federal Republic of Germany section of the West Europe DAILY REPORT and pertinent sections of the East Europe JPRS Report. Third country comment is published as available in the appropriate DAILY REPORT or JPRS publication.*

Editorial Views Warsaw Pact, NATO Summit

AU1106153490 East Berlin NEUE ZEIT in German 9 Jun 90 p 2

[Michael Albrecht editorial: "Departure for New Shores?"]

[Text] Was the end of the Warsaw Pact more or less its "silent burial," as the liberal Vienna daily DER STANDARD pointed out? This is hardly the case, even if the military alliance of the former socialist states must be seen in a different light than in past decades. The fact that representatives of bourgeois governments met for the first time with representatives of countries that are still under communist rule—the USSR and Bulgaria—for the routine summit of the heads of state and government is quite remarkable. In view of this novelty in the Kremlin, some of the participants recalled the pictures of former summits when the leaders embraced and kissed each other, leaders who had not been democratically elected by their peoples and who were not in a position to give up their ideological rigidity. Nor could they find new ways out of the blind alley of hostile images that they held up stubbornly and give up military doctrines that they obstinately advocated. This has indeed come to an end, and the most recent summit in Moscow marks a new beginning in every respect, concerning the assessment and the goals of the eastern military coalition.

As a matter of fact, one or more member states would like to withdraw from the body as soon as possible. However, the round of the seven decided finally not to dissolve the pact at this point, but to give it a new face and change its direction. The military alliance is to be gradually converted into a political community based on treaties. This would be in line with the spirit of the times, which is aimed at eliminating the thinking in terms of blocs and at removing the old hostile images. Only then will it be possible to fulfill the current tasks that are closely linked with disarmament and the creation of a new European security system, the declaration adopted in Moscow stresses.

It goes without saying that this new profile can only be introduced successfully if the behavior among the alliance partners also changes. Former vassals of all-powerful Kremlin leaders have in the past few months turned into sovereign and equal partners of the eastern superpower, which will in the future participate in the alliance's process of changes on a democratic basis and with its own intentions that are to be taken into consideration.

The fact that the talks in Moscow, and the almost simultaneous meeting of the NATO foreign ministers in Turnberry in Scotland, focused to a great extent on the German question shows the importance of this issue, but also the different approaches toward a solution. There continues to be dissent among the superpowers as to where a united Germany will find its place: In NATO, as demanded by the West, as an associated member in NATO and the Warsaw Pact at the same time, as most recently suggested by Gorbachev, or in NATO on the basis of the French model—that is, without military integration?

Premier Lothar de Maiziere, whose turn it was to chair the Moscow meeting, considers membership of today's GDR territory, which may be given a special military status, in the Western alliance quite possible, provided that NATO will change basically regarding its strategy and its military aspect. Mikhail Gorbachev, however, still finds it difficult to get used to this idea, even if one or another adviser has already hinted that the Soviet Union might be ready to accept German NATO membership on the basis of certain additional agreements.

However, in this connection it is necessary that the Western alliance finally starts to seriously think about new strategies and its future political self-image. This was advocated in Turnberry, but nothing really substantive was produced there. Statements by the "iron lady" that the continued presence of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons in Europe are indispensable, are not really suitable to convince politicians like Gorbachev, and Soviet military officials in particular, that NATO, too, wants to transform itself from a military alliance into a political one.

The German question which has often been viewed as a burden for East-West relations is turning out to be a link rather than a dividing wedge, given the time and the intensity with which both sides are trying to arrive at an acceptable solution. However, it is not very helpful if the Soviet Union insists on its rights as an ally over Germany—as recently done by the head of the International Department of the USSR Central Committee, Valentin Falin. Those who claim that a united Germany is not free to decide about its alliance membership show a lack of sensitivity and signal a deep-seated fear of a united Germany and its people. However, the Soviet Union in particular is entitled to demand more security and more guarantees than any other state, because of the unfortunate relations between the two states in their recent history.

Everything must be done now to avoid the impression that the Soviet Union has to be afraid of developments in Germany which "will again endanger the existence and the fate of the peoples of the Soviet Union." Gorbachev himself expressed the view on the sidelines of

the Moscow summit that both parts of Germany have demonstrated since the end of World War II that they are mature enough to handle the responsibility that they are assuming in the world. For this reason, Moscow should adopt a trusting attitude toward a future united German state, which understands itself as a product of the all-European unification efforts, and it should feel secure. Contacts and cooperation between the two military blocs would support and facilitate this process. The experts and strategists are indeed facing a great deal of work!

Meckel, EC Official on Integration Process

LD1106161290 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1516 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Berlin (ADN)—The GDR's integration into the EC was the focus of a meeting in Berlin today [11 June] between Foreign Minister Markus Meckel and EC Commission Vice President Frans Andriessen. They agreed to set up an interministerial working group, which will begin its work on Wednesday.

The interlocutors told the press that it is intended to help resolved practical problems in connection with this integration, and in particular to carry out preliminary work for the necessary alignment of the GDR laws to the community legislation.

Minister Meckel referred to the "GDR special case" in connection with future membership of the EC. What, in the case of other countries' entry, had taken years of preliminary negotiations and various stages, must, in the case of the GDR, be effected swiftly, given that the GDR would become a part of the EC more or less simultaneously with its accession to the FRG, according to the FRG Basic Law under Article 23. The restructuring of the GDR economy, which has now begun and which will be continued intensively, would require some kind of transition in this regard. It was now imporant to effect in one step, so to speak, the transition to the market economy and to the EC. This necessitated an extension of the contacts within the ministeries and an intensification of the cooperation. EC Commissioner Andriessen described the unification, and thus the strengthening of Germany, as a great advantage for the whole EC. This is the start of a very important process, for the unification of Germany means in practice also the entry of the GDR to the EC. Things are developing apace, and it it therefore of prime importance that close contact be maintained in order swiftly to overcome any difficulties which might emerge. The entry of the GDR is "shaped as a joint process." There would doubtless be adjustments and transitional periods for the GDR. [passage omitted]

De Maiziere Expects 'Huge Economic Upswings'

LD1106010790 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1035 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] New York (ADN reporter)—Following the Japanese economic decade, GDR Premier Lothar de Maiziere feels the Europeans are now very much on the way up. "I believe the revolutions in East Europe will in fact lead to a huge economic upswing in all of these countries," he told ADN optimistically, following his talks with U.S. businessmen in New York this evening [10 June].

In the opinion of De Maiziere's adviser Fritz Holzwarth, the U.S. partners made no secret of the fact that they seek a bridgehead for conquering the East European markets. At the same time, there is still skepticism regarding the "German-German home game," which, according to the GDR premier, does not exist. He could offer them—compared in international terms—advantageous land prices and the adoption of the FRG's investment law beginning 2 July.

In the future there will have to be consideration of both Europe and the Soviet Union and the North American democracies, "if we want to achieve a European security structure," the premier said. "This has been the intention since 1975, within the CSCE process, and it will be continued."

Expected To Present Gorbachev Plan

AU1106134690 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 11 Jun 90

[Ulrich Deupmann report: "Moscow Makes NATO Transformation Into Political Alliance Condition for Germany's Membership"]

[Text] New York, 10 June—During their talk today in Washington, Premier Lothar de Maiziere will present to U.S. President George Bush a security plan for a united Germany, which is fundamentally based on the ideas of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and of which the GDR delegation is convinced that it will bring about the breakthrough in the difficult negotiations on Europe's future, which have been going on for months. SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG learned this from De Maiziere's closest circles. The plan envisages united Germany membership in NATO. In return Gorbachev demands the transformation of NATO into a political alliance.

According to these ideas, the future five laender of the GDR are to be given a special status for a transitional period. The plan is to be valid until a European security structure under the auspices of the CSCE has been set up, which is to be achieved as quickly as possible. During that time, NATO troops will have no access to the territory of the present GDR, while Soviet units may remain deployed there. According to the plans, the special status will be agreed on contractually between NATO and Warsaw Pact. As has been revealed by the GDR delegation, Gorbachev is determined to actively push ahead with the dissolution of the military blocs.

During the private talk with De Maiziere on the fringes of the Warsaw Pact summit in Moscow last Thursday [7 June], the Soviet president said, according to this information, that he is striving for "compatible structures"

between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in armament conversion (the transformation of the military for civilian purposes) and disarmament. GDR government circles used the catchword of "partial NATO integration."

In return the Soviet Union expects NATO to make a clear decision to transform itself into a political alliance. Moscow links this expectation with the next NATO summit, which will take place in London at the beginning of July. "Eliminating only short-range nuclear weapons would be much too weak a reaction," it was said. Having nuclear missiles only hit Goerlitz is not sufficient. The second concession to the USSR consists of massive economic aid from the FRG to the weakened country.

In addition, the GDR Government is taking to the U.S. President the Warsaw Pact summit message that the eastern defense union cannot be revived again at all. At the meeting Hungary stated that even though it "does not want" to leave the Warsaw Pact "unilaterally," it will do so "at the end of 1991 at the latest." If the alliance continues to exist for the time being, this is so only to "clear up the mess" until a European CSCE peace system has been established. According to the summit decision, all military bodies of the Warsaw Pact will be completely subordinate to the political ones.

During his first meeting with Bush, De Maiziere intends to ask for understanding for Gorbachev's concerns and to present the GDR as "a bridge to the Eastern countries." The fears of the Kremlin mainly consist in the fact that the Soviet people do not understand German reunification. "We must not let the impression arise that Stalin won World War II and Gorbachev lost it," the Soviet leadership points out. The GDR Government wants to keep Gorbachev at the head of the Soviet Union "not only for reasons of power and technocracy."

The GDR premier's four-day trip to the United States started in New York on Saturday [9 June] with a meeting with FRG UN Representative Hans-Otto Braeutigam and with Cardinal John Joseph O'Connor. Braeutigam was the head of the FRG Permanent Mission to the GDR from 1982-88. On Sunday evening [10 June], De Maiziere planned to meet with World Jewish Congress President Edgar M. Bronfman. The GDR head of government previously announced that his country will soon start expert talks with the Conference of Jewish Material Claims, during which a settlement of the Jewish claims for compensation from the GDR are to be negotiated.

Speaks at Georgetown University

LD1106203490 Hamburg DPA in German 1824 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Washington (DPA)—Premier Lothar de Maiziere was received by U.S. President George Bush at the White House on Monday, the first GDR premier to receive the honor. [passage omitted]

In a lecture at Washington's Georgetown University, De Maiziere proposed an all-European security and peace union which should expand the present security structures in Europe. All the CSCE states should be involved in such an organization, he said. As the first practical steps in this direction, he suggested that the existing bodies of the Warsaw Pact and NATO should meet jointly at regular intervals, and thus first of all institutionalize all- European consultations. "From this, the CSCE council could arise at the foreign and defense minister-level," he said. A fundamental decision on this could be made at the CSCE summit in the autumn, at the latest, and a corresponding mandate agreed on. De Maiziere rejected the neutrality of a united Germany. "However, we can conceive of a united Germany within an all-European security system." German unification should further promote the overcoming of bloc confrontation and use the security policy links of the Germans toward East and West to this end. Unification should give powerful impetus to the process of disarmament in Europe. De Maiziere said that what was needed was "gradual collective disarmament to a level of mutual noncapacity to attack" and a further extension of arms control.

The changes in the countries of East Europe offered a political opportunity to move from mere preservation of peace to shared shaping of peace, the GDR premier said. German unification should end the division in Europe. At the two-plus-four talks it was absolutely indispensable for the security policy interests of East Europe to be taken into account, particularly those of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The chance of moving toward totally new forms of cooperation, and thus at the same time to achieve a lasting peace order was "greater than ever before."

Addresses U.S. Businessmen

LD1106211990 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1951 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Washington, (ADN reporter)—In an address today [11 June] to representatives of trade and industry in Washington, Premier Lothar de Maiziere described the absence of a trade agreement with the United States and of reciprocal most-favored-nation-status as detrimental to a swift development in economic cooperation. He hoped that with the support of the business world "and certainly also through our talks here in the United States, starting points can be found for a swift resolution of these matters in both our interests." De Maiziere had pressed for a normalization of trade in talks with business representatives in New York yesterday.

During his speech in the capital, the premier referred to the role of the U.S.-GDR trade and industry council, "which has performed a good service for 14 years and which includes renowned banks and companies." He expressed his gratitude for its commitment and its initiative, which are needed today more than ever. The

premier also had words of praise for the pioneering activity of all U.S. companies already operating in the GDR market.

The government leader said that it was a "dictate of prudence and reason" that the GDR should encourage investment from companies from other Western industrialized nations in addition to those from the FRG. He was thinking in particular of the United States. His government, for its part, wants to introduce fair competition through an antitrust law, creating equal conditions for companies from all countries. The first free elections and the democratic changes in the GDR, together with the economic and currency reform, had also created the conditions, in the premier's view, for the normalization and extension of trade and economic relations with the United States. He hoped that his visit would serve to multiply the contacts between financial and commercial companies from both states, to intensify reciprocal information processes, and to introduce further confidence-building economic-political measures. De Maiziere did not go into any further detail in his speech as to the steps he had in mind on most-favored-nation status and the relaxation of embargo stipulations.

'Very Satisfied' With Bush Meeting

LD1106211390 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1924 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Washington, (ADN reporter)—At an improvised news conference at the Lincoln Memorial today [11 June], Premier Lothar de Maiziere said that he was very satisfied with his meeting with U.S. President George Bush. The President was extraordinarily interested in the GDR's assessment of the situation in the wake of the latest meeting of the [Warsaw Pact] Political Consultative Committee. De Maiziere said that he described the declaration issued in Moscow as the smallest common denominator upon which agreement could be reached. There was also discussion at the White House on the form that a future European security structure should take.

There was consensus that this could only exist if the Soviet Union were incorporated within it. There could be no singularization of any country. The exchange of views also included the question of the alliance allegiance of the united Germany. De Maiziere told the President that a German membership presupposed a completely altered NATO, one which created acceptable conditions for Germany's East European neighbors as well. Bush referred to the U.S. nine-point plan and took the view that more extensive changes in the alliance might become discernible at the forthcoming NATO summit.

During one part of the discussion, centering on bilateral issues and the situation in the GDR, the premier, in his own words, describes a lively youth and student exchange program as something positive and desirable. After decades of isolation for young people, this would be one of the most important investments in the future. Bush assured him that he would make efforts to promote this.

Asked whether he could envisage Gorbachev's approval of NATO membership, De Maiziere answered that psychological difficulties would have to be overcome. Approval would no doubt depend also on a settlement regarding the stationing of Soviet troops, which are still in the GDR. Treaties must be concluded on this. It is important, however, in the interests of German sovereignty, to remove all rights of occupation. No decision has yet been made as to whether the necessary contractual settlements will be arranged between the Warsaw Pact and NATO or between a united Germany and the Soviet Union.

There are differing positions among the Warsaw Pact states on the alliance membership of a united Germany, the premier went on. He did not reveal any secret when he said that the Czechoslovaks and the Hungarians took a different view from the Romanians and Bulgarians.

De Maiziere did not rule out the creation of German unity by the end of the year. This depends on how those involved in the two- plus-four talks get things under way. There would probably be another Warsaw Pact summit by the end of the year. The GDR head of government did not say what he expected from this for the process of unification.

There are differing moods within the GDR, moods marked by the situation of a new beginning and by scepticism, De Maiziere said he told the U.S. President. What matters now is to give clear orientation for the future.

Wants Talks on Spy Problems

AU1106090290 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 9-10 Jun 90 p 2

[Olaf Ihlau report: "Pursuing Not Only the Stasi Spies"]

[Text] Berlin/GDR, 8 June—Premier Lothar de Maiziere is aiming for a "legal solution"—through negotiations with the FRG— to clear up as soon as possible the intra-German espionage problems. However, it could not be a matter of one side's agents being pursued and "the other side's being counted as the just," the East Berlin head of government said in a talk with SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG.

There will, "of course, have to be talks once again on this matter," De Maiziere announced. Because in the same way as Stasi [State Security Service] agents have occasionally been caught on FRG territory because of certain activities, conversely, there have been similar cases on GDR territory. "When we are a united Germany, we will probably have to find some kind of solution for all of them and say at some time: Now we want to stop spying on each other," the premier said. At the same time, he implied that corresponding sounding-out talks are already taking place between Bonn and East Berlin. In

the process of German unification there are also negotiations, "which are conducted in a less spectacular way."

Concerning reports that part of the former GDR spies might have been taken over by the Soviet intelligence service KGB, De Maiziere said that he considers this "a myth." There is nothing serious in this. One has to think about who is engaged in such agents' activities. Either they are people who love adventures, or they are interested in money, "and there is no money coming anymore." As regards the few agents who are doing their work out of conviction, the preconditions for their work will actually be missing in the future. Because every logically thinking person will hardly assume "that real existing socialism has a particularly big chance in the future."

Asked whether he assumes that a potential amnesty for spies will also apply to East Berlin's former intelligence service chief and deputy Stasi Minister Markus Wolf, the head of government said: "I have no reason to particularly support Mr. Wolf, because he was a member of this body long enough; there he was part of the apparatus, which, unfortunately, every modern country has." But one also has to take into account the historical preconditions. The GDR was a country at the border line between two alliances, which had opposed each other very much in the cold war. "There were also certain tasks, which had to be fulfilled as a result of the alliance obligations."

De Maiziere is convinced that there is no danger emanating anymore from the old apparatus of the Stasi empire. It has been possible to crush the structures. "I do not assume that there are any more units existing intact," the premier said. The former bugging centers are also under control. "I do not see any marked problems in this respect," he said.

Diestel Orders Registration of Stasi Officers

AU1206080590 East Berlin NEUE ZEIT in German 9 Jun 90 p 2

[ADN report: "Interior Minister Diestel: Registration of Stasi Officers"]

[Text] Berlin—"The government is advised to register the members of the former State Security Ministry [MfS] who work as officers for special tasks, and to draw the required conclusion concerning their workplace on an individual basis." This resolution was unanimously adopted by the commission that advises the government in connection with problems linked with the Stasi state security system. As the Interior Ministry announced on Friday [8 June], the commission convened for the second time under the leadership of Interior Minister Diestel.

The interior minister requested the Committee for the Dissolution of the former MfS/Office for National Security to immediately start investigations and to present results by the end of June at the latest. On this basis, the minister wants to discuss specific steps with the government commission.

Minister Diestel believes that this investigation will decisively contribute to uncovering the comprehensive structures that the Stasi established in the entire state. Officers for special tasks were like spiders in a slyly established network, the Interior Ministry statement stresses. Doing normal jobs, they were located in important positions in the country, such as in the economy, the administration, and other social spheres. The information they collected was passed on to the MfS. In addition, they used other persons as well who supplied them with information. "This Stasi swamp must be carefully located and dried out," Diestel stressed.

FRG Spies Reportedly Called Home

AU0806111690 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 4 Jun 90 p 16

[Unattributed report: "Spies Called Back"]

[Text] On 31 May, East Berlin transmitted the last radio message, by which agents of the former State Security Ministry [MfS] abroad were called back home. Until the collapse of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany regime and the smashing of its authority for espionage, the "Reconnaissance Main Administration" of the MfS had approximately 300 officers positioned in the FRG, who spied for the GDR either directly themselves or with the help of FRG State Security spies. When dozens of Stasi officers defected and spilt the beans to the FRG security services, the officers of the Reconnaissance Main Administration in East Berlin, whose department is to be dissolved on orders from the government, advised their former spies to finally retreat. "We were no longer able to guarantee the safety of our people," one of the former espionage chiefs stated. Familiar technology and experienced personnel were available for calling them back: The radio messages were transmitted by the "State Radio Operations Service" in Willmersdorf near Berlin—which was a well-discussed Stasi subdepartment until a few months ago (DER SPIEGEL No. 11/1990) and is today working for the Foreign Ministry.

Wolf Rejects KGB 'Takeover' Rumor

LD1106200690 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1900 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Former Deputy State Security Minister Markus Wolf has described as "absolute nonsense" allegations that the Soviet KGB had taken over whole contingents of former employees of the Foreign Intelligence Collection Main Administration of the State Security Ministry.

"Were I chief of the Soviet intelligence service I would not wish to take over anything whatsoever from this afflicted apparatus, the dissolution of which is accompanied by all manner of offers and defections. The risk is far too great," Wolf stressed in an interview with the

GDR youth newspaper JUNGE WELT (tomorrow's edition), which was prereleased to ADN. Wolf also rejected accusations that he had pulled the strings in this alleged handover of agents. "I spent several weeks in Moscow in February and March, so that I could have some peace to work on my second book."

Markus Wolf considers allegations that former Premier Hans Modrow had held negotiations in connection with this takeover in Moscow last December "as malicious slandering. I am very well acquainted with Hans Modrow and with his attitude to the problem of state security. I can rule out with absolute certainty the possibility that such negotiations took place." said Wolf, who is often referred to as the most successful secret service chief of the postwar era.

Asked how great was the danger of disclosure, betrayal, and extremism when very well-trained agents were forced into a social void, Markus Wolf said: "There is very little danger from the majority of employees of the intelligence service. But this danger will increase, the greater the delay in finding an overall solution to the problem." He knew that there were "massive offers from the BND [Federal Intelligence Service] and from the Office for the Protection of the Constitution," and there were indeed some defectors. Their number was apparently higher than it had been during his 35 years of service.

In Wolf's view, solutions must be found as soon as possible to the problem of the intelligence service, "above all through negotiations between the two German governments." He is now coming into the open in order to speed up the discussion. "In particular, a solution must be found once and for all to the problem of the inner-German secret service. Otherwise neither German state will find internal peace," Wolf stressed in conclusion to this, the first part of the interview.

Antall on Warsaw Pact, Troop Withdrawals

LD0806232690 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1905 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Interview with Premier Jozsef Antall by unidentified "Panorama" program reporter following the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative meeting in Moscow on 7 June—recorded

[Text] [Reporter] Mr. Premier, what will be the fate of the Warsaw Pact?

[Antall] I cannot tell you what will happen to the Warsaw Pact. I can, however, tell you what we did propose and what we can more or less expect.

With reference to the Warsaw Pact, our point of view was, what the decision of the Hungarian Parliament and indeed the government's program as well, clearly points out: that we, in line with the 1956 declaration, stand by the decision that Hungary should leave the Warsaw Pact. Naturally, this should not be a unilateral proclamation, under the present cirucmstances; therefore we have recommended that the Hungarian parliament examine the political, military, diplomatic, and other circumstances. We took our stance in the light of this here as well.

The Warsaw Pact in its present form and with its present functions is completley obsolete. We outlined the view that the Warsw Pact should be revised. With the suggestion that we were wishing to revise it, we indicated that we would like to leave open every option and possibility. Because what is in question here is that the individual member states do not judge the present situation or the future of the Warsaw Pact the same way. By using the word revision and by keeping radical transformation as the second key phrase, we reserve the option [of using the word revision] and also leave open the possibility for radical transformation.

Therefore, we recommend setting up a special committee, an inter- governmental committee, composed of ambassadors, who would take stock of the most important problems of the Warsaw Pact. We stressed that we must now eliminate all elements which offend the sovereignty of individual countries, and we must regain complete sovereignty over the Army. On our part, we wish to restore complete sovereignty over the Army, and we also find it extremely important that every element of confrontation be eliminated from the Warsaw Pact.

[Reporter] Excuse me; do we now want the Warsaw Pact or not?

[Antall] Do we want the Warsaw Pact? If we must give a straightforward answer to this, then we must say, that we, for ourselves, find retaining the Warsaw Pact unnecessary. Hungary's neighbors are neutral countries, or countries of the Warsaw Pact, and we do not see ourselves threatened by any country, countries which belong to NATO. Therefore we do not feel directly threatened, so we propose closing down the Warsaw Pact.

[Reporter] Then why is such a long transition period necessary? You proclaimed a rather rapid program before the elections, and it appears that you have backtracked.

[Antall] That is entirely mistaken. The withdrawal of Soviet troops must not be confused with the Warsaw Pact [Varsoi Paktum]. The withdrawal of Soviet troops is a separate issue. In this regard, a country obviously must wish for and demand the quickest possible pull-out of Soviet troops. There is a set timetable for this, and we naturally would welcome an acceleration of this timetable. However, these as well, are technical issues. The other matter, the existence of the Warsaw Pact: From our viewpont we could say that it is unnecessary, if we examine the basic objectives which motivated the creation of the Warsaw Pact.

[Reporter] What is your opinion of Gorbachev? How strong is Gorbachev's position? What were you able to extract from the conversation?

[Antall] Naturally, it would be difficult, scarcely possible, to draw a conclusion from our having sat opposite to one another at the table. I imagine his difficulties are enormous. Gorbachev did not even conceal this at our separate discussion which we conducted, in the framework of bilateral talks, after the session of the Political Consultative Committee. Their economic and other problems are grave. It is public knowledge what difficulties the Soviet Union has, what financial and other problems are emerging.

In spite of this, I think that Gorbachev will be able to strengthen his position, and there is a chance that under Gorbachev's leadership, the Soviet Union will be able to progress further. Naturally, no one can foresee tomorrow's events.

[Reporter] Hungary has always been a kind of reform-laboratory for the Soviet Union. These reforms, if I may say so, have succeeded too well. What does Gorbachev say to Hungarian developments, to the election results?

[Antall] Gorbachev emphasized, at the bilateral discussion, that he fully understood our viewpoints, he understood the views we expressed, including the wish not to remain in the Warsaw Pact in its current form, and we do not wish by any means to remain a member of it. We even decided on the autumn talks. We offered to conduct a discussion on this in Budapest, at an extraordinary session of the Political Consultative Committee. After preparation, in January we shall begin thorough, substantive talks. The Political Consultative Committee accepted this. Gorbachev also accepted our political line, including the multiparty system, free market economy, and everything else. Indeed, he emphasized that he supports our political line, on the basis of the principle of full equality and nonintervention.

Therefore, from this viewpoint, we were expressly encouraged. We also emphasized, naturally that while we wish to eliminate the dependence, in every sense, on the

Soviet Union—both economic and political—we still endeavor to maintain bilateral economic relations with the Soviet Union, since this is an important national interest of ours.

[Reporter] But Gorbachev's situation is not stable. What will happen if he is not the leader of the Soviet Union, but it is different, tougher politician than him. Are you prepared for such a situation?

[Antall] The world is quite visibly prepared to try to support Gorbachev by every means. I can safely say that either from the statements of President Bush, or Chancellor Kohl, or others, or I can even say that from conversations with them and letters from them, it is quite clear that the Western world is prepared to support Gorbachev, and they are also inspiring us in this direction.

[Reporter] This will not put more bread in Moscow's shops.

[Antall] More bread there will not be, but neither will there be more bread if Gorbachev falls. At present, in the Soviet Union, these are signs of crisis, which it can be said are the problems of a large empire, where they are simply unable to organize supplies, given this structure. I think that this will continue to be a serious problem in the Soviet Union for quite some time, and assistance from the West, I imagine, will be only temporary or effective only in the short run.

We talked more about questions of foreign policy. He talked about his U.S. experiences, and his personal discussions with President Bush, and, what was a very important element in today's discussions, Gorbachev in fact accepted U.S. military presence in Europe. This was important for us especially, because we always emphasized this, not only during my travels to the United States but also in my statements to several Western newspapers. The U.S. military presence in Europe is a stabilizing factor, and as I have also said in the Hungarian papers, we regard the idea of European integration, European unity, as one which does not conflict with the idea of the Atlantic alliance. We regard the Atlantic idea as an existing one, extending beyond simply NATO. What this means, the Atlantic idea, is North American and European cooperation, and there is no European security without the United States or without the Soviet Union.

Warsaw Pact Meeting Favorably Assessed

AU1106131990 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 9 Jun 90 p 1

[Peter Barabas editorial: "There Was No Burial"]

[Text] "Rumors of the imminent burial of the Warsaw Pact proved to be exaggerated, and, for the time being, the Pact is well and is trying to reorgnize itself into a political body by means of radical reforms"—an ITV reporter properly summed up the events in Moscow on 7 June.

Without putting every opinion on the drugstore scales, one thing is nevertheless perceptible with certainty—namely, the easing of the tension that was so perceptible in the days preceding the summit.

Naturally, nobody expected the leaders voicing different opinions to agree on everything overnight. Obviously, these differences of views continued. We could also see this from the published parts of Gorbachev's and Antall's speeches. The Hungarian premier pointed out that, as a remnant of the European confrontation, the Warsaw Pact has lost its main function and, therefore, the organization should eliminate military cooperation by the end of next year. Antall would prefer the creation of a new European security system, instead of reforming this organization. However, Gorbachev stressed the possibility of reforming the Warsaw Pact, and he took a stand against unilateral dissolution.

Despite the different tones and emphases, one has the impression that the politicians refrained from arguing, and they greatly considered each others' interests. This is also clear from Jozsef Antall's position according to which every attempt to keep the Soviet Union out is unacceptable. "We do not want the current line that divides Europe to move further to the East. The only rational alternative is to completely eliminate this division."

It is a compliment to the calm Hungarian position that the premier did not stress the Hungarian intention of unilateral withdrawal in Moscow; instead, he mainly spoke of the need to reevalute Hungary's membership in the organization. At the same time, by urging the consideration of facts that hurt the sovereignty of the member countries, the Hungarian premier made it clear what the areas in which he wanted immediate changes are.

The times of dictates have passed, and it seems that every new Hungarian statesman discovers this from time to time. "I understood from my talks with Mikhail Gorbachev that their views about our world currently being formed are almost carbon copies of our views.... A strange situation has emerged in which leading powers in Europe and the world have an identical view on the future line of development"—interim president Arpad Goncz said and we can also feel the element of surprise in his words.

It seems that a Europe based on blocs is something of the past in the minds of politicians. There are no major differences in the need for eliminating the current division of Europe. Perhaps the road leading to the elimination of this division is viewed differently in Budapest, Warsaw, Prague, Moscow, and Bucharest.... The Hungarian Government would prefer to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, but it is alone with this intention. Even Vaclav Havel, whose opinion is allegedly closest to the Hungarian one, thinks that we should rather reform this organization from within, instead of withdrawing from it.

All this reflects the radically new nature of things in which differences of interests no longer exist only between the Soviet Union and its allies, but the interests

of the allies themselves differ from each other. This is also reflected in the way they regard German reunification and NATO.

The Soviet Government has reservations concerning united Germany's NATO membership. However, despite the fact that it regards the post-war international system based on ideological confrontation as obsolete, the Hungarian Government does not worry about the existence of NATO, on the contrary, it accepts this. Of course, there is a contradiction here. However, such differences of views did not lead to dramatic developments in Moscow.

Nothing is more characteristic of the radically changed atmosphere than the fact that the Hungarian delegation, which obviously left for Moscow with quite a lot of concern, could return from Moscow with a feeling of success. Although it represented the most radical opinion, the Hungarian delegation was able to assert some of its ideas without confrontation.

All this reflects something extremely important and essential. Is it possible that we are learning to coexist here in East Europe in a civilized way?

Soviet Troop Withdrawal Continues on Schedule

LD1106165190 Budapest MTI in English 1538 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 11 (MTI)—The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary is continuing according to schedule. Colonel Gyorgy Keleti, spokesman of the Hungarian Army, also said that 12 troop trains and 7 freight trains left the country last week, bringing to 223 the number of Soviet military trains that have crossed the border. This is 16.5 per cent of the 1,352 trains required for the complete withdrawal of the Soviet troops, staff and military technology, stationed in Hungary.

Jeszenszky on Foreign Policy by National Interest

AU1106114090 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 2 Jun 90 p 4

[Interview with Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky by Imre Krajczar; place and date not given: "We Will Gladly Negotiate With Anyone if They Accept Nonviolence"; first paragraph is NEPSZAVA introduction]

[Text] In the interview given by Geza Jeszenszky to NEPSZAVA, he primarily focused not only on the Central-East European area, but also on the Hungarian-CSFR relations. Answering the first question, Jeszenszky pointed out that the new Hungarian Republic, which was born after the obvious failure of the political and social regime and social experiment forced upon the Central-East European area, will conduct an independent foreign policy based on the priority of national interests. At least for the time being, the international situation is favorable for this because all the big powers accept and support the political changes here and the full implementation of Hungarian sovereignty.

[Krajczar] What can Hungary count on if it wants to achieve a situation in which the foreign troops temporarily stationed in Hungary are really only stationed temporarily?

[Jeszenszky] For the benefit of Hungary's independence and security, we are striving to have foreign troops leave our territory even before the scheduled deadline of June 30 1991. In addition to a properly trained and armed Hungarian Army, we must rely on a new and all-European collective security system in defending our state territory and our new political system. Properly prepared, this is worth more than neutrality without big power guarantees. It is one of the major tasks of the Hungarian foreign policy to create such a system of agreements, but this requires thorough international negotiations. However, even before this, we must also create a system of bilateral and regional contractual relations with our neighboring countries in the very near future, a system of contacts guaranteeing mutual interests and good neighborly relations.

[Krajczar] What is your opinion on Hungarian-CSFR relations? Is the Hungarian Government preparing new initiatives?

[Jeszenszky] I think that the main issue in the Hungarian-Czeck and Hungarian-Slovak relations, as well as in our relations with the other neighbors, is the extent to which our neighboring countries are ready to conduct the same policy, including the issue of human rights, as the one we are ready to conduct. We will gladly sign bilateral agreements, naturally, even on the issue of national minority rights. However, we think that these bilateral agreements will be more acceptable and welcome to all of us if we place them in a much wider framework. More specifically: The national minority issue is not only a Hungarian-Romanian or Hungarian Slovak issue, but an all-European one. The human rights conference in Copenhagen will provide the opportunity to deal with this issue in a wider framework.

[Krajczar] What is your opinion about the oft-quoted so-called principle of "reciprocity?"

[Jeszenszky] I can accept this to a certain extent. We are ready to accept the demands formulated by the national minorities living in Hungary, demands that are compatible with the demands and interests of our population; these are really compatible. We will carry out everything that is a realistic demand. This really depends on the people in question. I think that it is not the Czeckoslovaks who must tell the Slovaks and other national minorities living here what they need, but the people themselves should know what they really want. We are

ready to open national minority schools, but it is important to really have students in those schools. I accept reciprocity in this respect—namely, to do at home everything that we expect abroad too. At the same time, there are conditions which make it hard for me to accept the principle of reciprocity. We are not talking about equal size national minorities here. One cannot create the same conditions for both sides, this is not justified.

[Krajczar] In your view, could the possible use and acceptance of the principle of reciprocity affect the situation of Hungarians abroad in some way, as well as the relations between Budapest and its neighbors? Watching the events since Trianon, or we could go back in history even further, one has the impression that, in this respect, Hungarian policy has no effect whatsoever on our neighbors.

[Jeszenszky] Indeed, there is such a danger and such experience. Therefore, I think it is particularly important not to regard these issues as bilateral problems but part of a broader system of international norms. It would perhaps make the Slovaks feel calmer if they understood that whatever we demand or regard as natural is not some kind of special thing but fully accords with a modern practice. Take the example of Canada, which is taking broad measures to guarantee the culture and identity of the various nationalities there.

[Krajczar] According to some signs, the Hungarian Government is re-evaluating Budapest's policy toward the Middle East. What is your opinion about Hungarian-Arab relations, and generally about East European-Arab relations?

[Jeszenszky] It is not an easy task to ease the tension. There are different and contradictory demands and positions here. On the other hand, there are more moderate voices on each side which are promising. On the one side, there is recognition of Israel and the acceptance of the obligation to refrain from establishing new colonies in the occupied territories. We regard these trends as promising, and we are also trying to mediate between the two sides in accordance with these trends. We are seeking acceptable elements in the positions of both sides. This includes the recognition of some sort of Palestinian statehood, but the concrete forms of such an entity are still impossible to outline.

[Krajczar] Visiting the area, I often heard complaints that, contrary to the representatives, presidents, and premiers of other East European countries, the official Hungarian representatives, ministers, state ministers, and party leaders keep avoiding a meeting with the representatives of the Arabs living in the occupied territories. Does the future balanced Hungarian foreign policy intend to change this practice? The question is all the more justified because the meetings of the leaders of our neighboring countries with Palestinian officials did not threaten their relations with the Israeli Government. Will something similar be included in the new Hungarian foreign policy attitude?

[Jeszenszky] It will definitely be included, but I remember that several Palestinian leaders who took a stand in favor of peace and rapprochement were killed a few years ago. The PLO declared itself the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. If we do not believe in the one-party system, we will also find it hard to accept this attitude.

[Krajczar] Several Palestinian information, cultural, and other centers are operating in Jerusalem which are appreciated by all the Palestinians, perhaps more than the PLO center in Tunis. These centers are recognized as legitimate by the Arabs living in the occupied territories. The leading representatives of our neighboring countries regularly meet with these political figures during their visits to Israel. President Havel was the last to talk with them. Is it possible that the representatives of the new Hungary will also find their way to these figures?

[Jeszenszky] We will gladly negotiate with anyone who accepts the principle of nonviolence.

Views EC Membership

LD1106140290 Budapest MTI in English 1308 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 11, 1990 (MTI-ECONEWS)—Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky has expressed the view that it is too early to fix a date for Hungary to join the EC as it depends largely on the capacity of the Hungarian economy to change and expand.

Mr. Jeszenszky was speaking to the Brussels correspondent of MTI-ECONEWS after signing an agreement with Frans Andriessen, vice president of the EC Commission, to open an EC representation in Budapest, the first ever in an East European country.

Even if Hungary were granted immediate membership, Mr. Jeszenszky added, Hungary would not be able in [as received] a position to take advantage. The waiting period, made necessary by, among other things, EC's preparation for 1992, is essential, he said for Hungary to prepare itself.

While Hungary accepts Mr Andriessen's position that association agreements between the EC and East European states should be tailored to the situation in each country, Hungary's own agreement must not be delayed because other countries are not ready to enter the same process as quickly, Mr. Jeszenszky added.

National Assembly Session Ends; Agenda Noted

LD1106165590 Budapest MTI in English 1629 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 11 (MTI)—The Hungarian National Assembly ended its Monday workday with announcement of reports. The session is to continue on Tuesday morning. And, under the agenda, the MPs will discuss the proposals related to membership in the

committees, and committee members will also be elected. Also on Tuesday, MPs will discuss, with urgency motion, the bill on amnesty.

A high-ranking guest will attend Tuesday's session: King Baudouin, who is to arrive for an official visit to Budapest on Tuesday, is expected to make a speech in parliament.

On Monday, parliament elected a new minute-taker as Istvan Balas (Hungarian Democratic Forum) [MDF] stepped down from this function in view of his other many committee tasks. The MPs elected, with a secret vote, Jozsef Horvath, a candidate of the MDF parliamentary group, Minute-taker of parliament, with 266 votes for and 8 against.

Analyzing the bill on amending the constitution, MPs set forth their arguments, for and against, the means of electing the president of the republic, and the agreement between the Hungarian Democratic Forum and the Alliance of Free Democrats. A new element of the remarks made on Monday is that two MPs of the MDF, Janos Palotas and Mrs. Nagy, nee Agnes Maczo, cast their votes—for the time being in words only—in favour of the direct election of the president.

British Secretary of State for agriculture John Gummer, and the delegation of the Liberal International, sat in on the session of parliament for a short while.

Democratic Forum Pledges Support to Antall

LD1006010890 Budapest MTI in English 1815 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 9 (MTI)—The board of the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] supports Jozsef Antall's government and agrees with the MDF-AFD [Alliance of Free Democrats] accord which facilitates the operation of parliament, the MDF board declared at its closed-door session on Saturday [9 June].

In view of the sharp criticism the board drew at a MDF rally a week ago, the body now surveyed the relationship between the party's leadership and its parliamentary faction and dealt with inner organizational problems as well.

The board decided that MDF's organizational structure has to be reconsidered and the new statutes worked out with reliance on concrete proposals from the local organizations.

At the same time, the body does not consider it appropriate to re-elect officials and will continue to operate with unchanged personnel over the next two years until its mandate expires.

Plan for Settling Land Ownership Submitted

LD1006225690 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1600 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Jenoe Gerbovics, minister without portfolio, has submitted a new plan for settling the land ownership issue. This announcement was made by the politician in Pecs, at the national conference of the Recsk Association. Csaba Belenyesi reports:

[Belenyesi] [passage omitted] The Recsk Association recommends that everyone receive 5,000 forints in cash and some additional pension entitlements or government bonds. Jenoe Gerbovics, who is responsible for rehabilitations, stated in his contribution that the misunderstanding with the Association of German Minorities in Hungary has been cleared up. This arose from the fact that if the 1947 property ownership position was restored, then Germans who remained at home but lost their land would be left out from those who will be rehabilitated. He said that those robbed Germans are entitled to compensation. Contary to expectations, Jenoe Gerbnovics did not talk about the government's position on the form of compensation.

Later, in response to a question from Budapest Radio and MTI, he said he agreed that the government should discuss this within 100 days. He has already formed his views, but would not like to disclose these before the cabinet makes a decision on this matter. Finally, the minister without portofolio told representatives of the press that he submitted a proposal to the government on the method for settling the land question.

[Begin Gerbovics recording] This is a settlement plan in six stages, based on the criticism of the present land position. Our starting point is that the first step should be to start with the possibilities based on the existing land law. [end recording]

Serb Democratic Federation Holds Meeting

LD1006225490 Budapest MTI in English 1917 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 10 (MTI)—The 1st, two-day general assembly of the Serb Democratic Federation drew to a close in Szentendre on Sunday [10 June].

Participants adopted the federation's statutes and manifesto and elected an MP and the national board.

The manifesto of the Serb Democratic Federation, which broke away from the Democratic Federation of South Slavs in Hungary on January 23 this year, calls for fostering the minority culture, setting up an autonomous cultural system, organizing Hungary's Serb population, and establishing close cooperation with the Serbian Orthodox Church, which has always played an extremely major part in the life of Hungarian Serbs.

Milan Nedelykov was elected president of the federation. The general assembly took the stand that the election of minority MPs gains special significance through the present political and economic conditions. They stated that although the institution of the commissioner of minority rights planned by the Hungarian parliament is indispensable, it can be no substitute for this right.

Holding Company To Launch Business Newsletter

LD1106153690 Budapest MTI in English 1517 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Budapest, June 11, 1990 (MTI-ECONEWS)—Cohfin, the Hungarian holding company of the De Benedetti group, established last December, and MTI, the Hungarian news agency is to start a new business, financial and economic newsletter, called the COHFINANCIAL HUNGARIAN BUSINESS REVIEW.

The review will be published in Hungary every two weeks and will provide information and news about Hungarian business, financial and economic developments.

The English language publication will be launched in July and will be distributed to subscribers throughout the world.

Poll Compares U.S., USSR Popularity

PM1106102690 Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish 19 May 90 p 4

[Article by Eugeniusz Smilowski, deputy director of the Public Opinion Survey Center: "Their Hearts Are in America: Poles View USSR and United States"]

[Text] As recently as late 1987, Poles regularly declared equally warm feelings toward the USSR and the United States. Much has changed since then.

The opinion poll conducted last February demonstrated that a definitive turn has taken place in people's affections in favor of the United States. Today the Polish public declares its pro-American sympathies louder and more unanimously than any other nation.

The United States is the only state toward which our positive sentiments—as measured on a temperature scale ranging from minus 50 to plus 150 degrees—are expressed so universally (91 percent of respondents) and so ardently (mean temperature plus 28 degrees.) It commands the first place on the list of states which people are most eager to visit (24 percent) and emigrate to (25 percent.) It has risen to the position of Poland's number one ally (23 percent), thus forcing the Soviet Union down to second position (18 percent)—and we should remember that it was not so long ago that the latter's position was still unchallenged. Now the Soviet Union is more and more often perceived as a state which poses a threat to Poland (24 percent), though, to tell the truth, we still fear the Germans (70 percent) more than the Russians (10 percent.) It is significant that more than 30 percent of respondents believe that Poland has no friends or true allies at all.

Here it should be stressed that the shift which is changing our orientation in America's favor has not generated new anti-Soviet feelings: It only threw them into sharper relief and made our opinions and assessments of our eastern neighbor so much more intense. More than 60 percent of the Public Opinion Survey Center [CBOS] respondents continue to declare their positive feelings toward the the Soviet Union, and there is little public approval of anti-Soviet demonstrations. The recent well-publicized anti-Soviet disturbances were regarded leniently by only 18 percent of respondents, while 45 percent expressed their unequivocal condemnation.

Even such facts as the reluctance—felt by about half of Polish people—to accept the loss of Poland's former eastern territories or the stationing of Soviet troops in Poland (43 percent), and the perception of a continued dependence on Moscow (46 percent) have not altered the emotional attitudes of the majority of the population. Perhaps the close prospect of a unified, large German state brings home to Polish people the necessity of continued alertness; this could be why the majority of respondents expressed their approval of maintaining the Soviet military contingent in Poland (59 percent) and Poland's continued membership of the Warsaw Pact (61 percent). This stance is not dictated merely by immediate political objectives or defense reasons, since only very few respondents (9 percent) are convinced of the Soviet Union's military supremacy. Poles are not even sure whether a state of military balance exists between the USSR and the United States, since 44 percent of those questioned ascribe a supremacy in this field to the United States. It is more by intuition that they assume that Poland's security would be better served if a balance of power between the two superpowers were maintained (56 percent.) All the same, the political shift that took place in Poland and the development of events in the Soviet Union have given most Poles reason to doubt the future of the alliance potential with the USSR: Only 14 percent believe that in the event of a threat we could absolutely rely on the Soviet Union's launching a military defense of Poland's borders.

One factor which undoubtedly keeps our good opinion of the Soviet Union going is Mikhail Gorbachev himself. In the present era of personified politics, a politician's created image is of vital importance in the public eye—the more so as, in contrast to his predecessors' record, the Soviet leader has managed to win the lasting approval of worldwide public opinion at an unprecedented rate and to a rarely noted extent. In Poland, too, his position in the public eye has been unchallenged for several years, though recently his rating seems to have fallen slightly.

During Ronald Reagan's presidency, the odds were clearly in Gorbachev's favor; now the impaired opinion of U.S. presidents that the majority of Poles formed in that period is being repaired fast thanks to George Bush. The latest CBOS opinion poll (March 1990) showed that 79 percent of respondents—selected from a representative random sample of the adult Polish population—held a favorable opinion of Mikhail Gorbachev, and 76 percent held a similar opinion of George Bush. However, when we compare the actual approval indices, we will find that Gorbachev's personal qualities and his main "trump cards" of glasnost and perestroyka still place him in the lead (79 percent) before Bush (66 percent of respondents declared they liked him); nevertheless, the difference between these ratings is that the Soviet president's popularity is stable, whereas George Bush's is still on the increase.

The popular appraisal of the two great nations appears to be governed by different criteria from those determining the assessment of their leaders. When we compare the attributes which are most often ascribed to the Russians and the Americans, we will find that the high rate of personal liking and approval for Mikhail Gorbachev is scarcely reflected in the popular opinion and image of the Soviet people, whereas the projected image of the American people is even more favorable than that of President George Bush. The Americans are most often pictured as progressive (87 percent); independent (85 percent); future-oriented (83 percent); democratically-minded (80 percent); selfish (80 percent); active (78

percent); optimistic (75 percent); hard-working (74 percent); patriotic (65 percent); and conscientious (63 percent). We can see, therefore, that out of the 10 most often quoted attributes only one is negative. In the case of the Russians, half of the most quoted attributes are rather negative. The Russians are most often described as patriotic (73 percent); selfish (62 percent); lazy (61 percent); peace-loving (60 percent); bellicose (59 percent); subservient to the authorities (58 percent); power-seeking (57 percent); uncomplicated (50 percent); future-oriented (50 percent); and optimistic (49 percent). A review of the least-attributed qualities illustrates the negative side of the dominant stereotype even more clearly. While the qualities least often ascribed to the Russians are integrity (20 percent), industry (18 percent) and conscientiousness (17 percent), those least seen in American people are superficiality (29 percent), contentiousness (18 percent), and laziness (16 percent).

The question whether there are more things that bring Poles and Russians together or more things that divide them tends to polarize public opinion particularly strongly. Those who see more differences are in the lead (52 percent). Their arguments make up a detailed list of wrongs, injustices, and grievances: the partitions and the Russification campaign; the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact; the Katyn atrocity; and the forced resettlements and camps. Then, Yalta and the loss of out eastern territories; the limitation of Poland's sovereignty; and the economic despoilment. A different perspective is assumed by those who concentrate on Polish-Russian ties (41 percent). They stress the Slav unity; the brotherhood of arms during World War II, and the role played by the USSR in Poland's liberation; the assurance of border security guaranteed by the mutual military alliance; and the economic ties (materials and fuels.)

The change of orientation in our political sympathies resulted directly in an altered assessment of each superpower's contribution to the preservation and consolidation of world peace. Even less than three years ago the emphasis was clearly on the active contribution on the part of the Soviet Union, whereas today the predominant belief is that Moscow and Washington are to be credited with equal contributions. A direct comparison between these two superpowers shows that the U.S. contribution is valued more highly.

The results reported above are highly significant. On the whole, the era in which the Soviet Union was perceived as Poland's sole ally is over and gone. Today, the eyes of many Poles are turning toward the United States, which personifies their ideas of a strong, well-organized, and modern state. Our good mood is marred by the occasional realization of our civilizational backwardness and the uncertainty over whether Poland can really enter into genuine partnership with a state that accords the title of its number one ally in Europe to Germany.

Perhaps this is why we suffer from a sense of isolation and helplessness, especially as the old configuration of international links and ties is no longer in operation, nor has it been replaced by a new one. All the same, is it not striking that for many Poles the road to Europe apparently leads through America?

Border Treaty With Germany, Reparations Wanted

AU1106111090 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG in German 3 Jun 90 p 11

[Heinz Vielain report: "Poland Wants Border Treaty and Reparations"]

[Excerpt] Bonn—Poland wants united Germany not only to recognize the Oder-Neisse border by treaty, but also to pay reparations.

According to information acquired by WELT AM SONNTAG, this is the reason why the preparations for a joint German declaration on laying down Poland's western border are becoming increasingly difficult.

As WELT AM SONNTAG has learned, the FRG Government is absolutely against including Poland's demands in the intended joint German declaration. Only a statement on the border is at issue.

On 21 June the Bundestag and the People's Chamber in East Berlin want to made identical declarations of intent on recognition of Poland's western border—that is, the final renunciation of the former eastern territories of Germany beyond the Oder and the Neisse.

A direct border treaty as early as now would suit the Polish Government best. The governments in Bonn and East Berlin want to comply with its wishes as far as possible. They want to notify the text of the parliaments' declarations of intent, as is customary after the conclusion of negotiations on a treaty. The renunciation of the territory is to be later ratified by an all-German parliament.

As WELT AM SONNTAG has learned, Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth (Christian Democratic Union) is planning to appear together with GDR People's Chamber President Sabine Bergmann-Pohl in the Warsaw parliament to affirm the declarations of intent on recognition of the Oder-Neisse border. [passage omitted]

Jaruzelski on German Unification Issue

LD1006223590 Warsaw PAP in English 1825 GMT 10 Jun 90

[By PAP reporter Jerzy Malczyk]

[Text] Moscow, June 10—Soviet daily RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA published on Saturday a short interview granted by Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski during his recent visit to Moscow paid in connection with the Warsaw Treaty summit.

Speaking about Poland's stand on the question of the unification of Germany, the president said that Poland

was interested for this process to be part of the process of Europe's integration. We hope that united Germany will be a democratic and peacefully disposed state with their armed forces set at a minimal level. A state which will take into account opinions of its neighbors, which will understand their fears.

The most urgent problem is to remove the border issue from the agenda, said the Polish president.

Walesa on Creating Political Pluralism

PM1106100090 Paris LE MONDE in French 10-11 Jun 90 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Solidarity Chairman Lech Walesa by Gabriel Meretik in Gdansk on 6 June]

[Text] Gdansk—[Meretik] You have been very active recently, you frequently intervene, sometimes in an authoritarian way, for instance by firing Henryk Wujec, secretary of the Citizens' Committees and by threatening to fire GAZETA editor Adam Michnik.

[Walesa] There are no disagreements between Adam Michnik and me, just a different assessment of the situation in Poland and of how to build its future. It is unacceptable that, after eliminating the Communists, our enemy, we should take their place. We must build pluralism. This is what is now happening, rather like what happened when Lenin and Stalin built their regime. We have remained alone on the battlefield, the government has no opposition, but it has no foundation. Some people are trying to safeguard unity at all costs. They say that it is vital, that Poland is poor and we must remain united. These are fine slogans, but I think that they are wrong. Unity is vital in a struggle. It is easy to be united against an enemy. Unity in everyday work is impossible. Society is divided. We must therefore allow everybody to find his place. At present, I feel that we are trying to forcibly maintain a single bloc, as the party did in the past. This is dangerous. That is why I want to break it. I want a left, a right, and a center to emerge. I want these to be established in Poland, I want us finally to be a normal country and not an artificial and dangerous configuration.

Today the threat is not very great because we have wonderful people like Michnik, Geremek, Mazowiecki, and, to some extent, Walesa. This is not dangerous. But others will follow us. Others will take advantage of this unity, this "national unity front," because that is what it is. Others will benefit from it and we will create such a hell for our children that our children will curse us even more than we curse the Communists. That is why I am trying to start a movement in Poland to divide things, not the country, not Poland, but to create a pluralist, creative division.

[Meretik] How do you see that division?

[Walesa] For the time being, I have started to set things in order because I think that is necessary. It is unacceptable for Henryk Wujec to be both in the Citizens' Committees and in the parliamentary group. We in Poland must learn to "go." In the United States, when the President has to leave the White House, he is probably not very happy about it, but he regards it as normal. In our country, when somebody has been give a position, it is impossible to oust him. It is like my dispute with Michnik. Adam is my friend. I like him very much, but when I appointed him as GAZETA editor, it was for the elections, for the election campaign. Since then, things have changed. Now I learn that his newspaper is owned by an unnamed company, a commercial enterprise. My appointment is therefore no longer valid. He should either hand the post back to me or have himself appointed by his company, but, in any case, he must no longer use the Solidarity initials which only belong to the trade union.

[Meretik] How do you view the political scene in the country?

[Walesa] We are told that people in Poland do not want political parties. They do not want them because Solidarity does not want them, because we are preventing their formation. Even if we continue to say that we are the best, that we know best, that we have proved for years that we know how to struggle—by we, I mean Geremek, Mazowiecki, Kuron, Michnik, and myself. That was fine for a time, during the struggle, but it is no longer any good. If it were to continue, it would be a very bad thing for Poland. Even Albania would overtake us. The people say that it is difficult to fight elections with 100 parties. It is difficult at first. If those 100 parties, however, have even only 100 members each, you already have 10,000 people committed to a political struggle, and who feel involved.

However, what have we done? We have formed an elite, with me at its head, as if the others did not count. If we continue to tell them "let us handle it," it is likely to be very dangerous for Poland. We must speed up greater participation by the citizens in exercising power, we must encourage new political divisions, left and right, or, as in Europe, between christian democratic and social democratic parties. Maintaining Solidarity is a bad thing. Solidarity is now like the former national unity front. As of now it is untainted, but in two years' time the movement will be tarnished. I do not want that. We fought so well, we lived so well. Why destroy that beautiful symbol? Let us put it away while it is still intact, let us safeguard it. We should not leave it to GAZETA which is becoming a rag or which will become a rag sooner or later, when Michnik has left. Let us put the beautiful symbol of Solidarity away, we must not allow it to be soiled. It will serve our children when they fight against us.

[Meretik] What is your objective?

[Walesa] To go fishing.

[Meretik] Why?

[Walesa] I am a centrist. I am more or less in the center, but slightly to the right. I belong to the Christian people. I have no experience in parties. I could have made Solidarity into a party, the biggest party. Moreover, I could still do so. I am capable of doing it. All the others would be flabbergasted. But, once again, they would say that I had done something grandiose. I do not want, however, to be seen as a great man. I simply want to build a great Poland. I have no political ambitions, I just want to restore order in Poland. I have been waging my struggle for 25 years. I do not want my name to be cursed in 25 years' time. There are too many sordid machinations around Solidarity and some other groups. This is all because there is no pluralism.

[Meretik] The Union of the Center has put you forward as candidate for president....

[Walesa] They want to be noticed. That is why they put forward this question of the presidency and named me. It has nothing to do with me. I have not played any part in it. Of course, they are friends, and the center is very close to me; I am a centrist. I certainly do not lead that movement, I am not a member of it, but I welcome its existence because it strengthens pluralism. I really do not want to be president. I am too busy, too active. But fate will play a dirty trick on me. There will be so many disagreements and conflicts, that I will be forced to do it. Nobody will be strong enough to stop me. I am capable of winning a majority and I will have to do so. But, honestly, I only dream of going fishing.

[Meretik] Are you still at war with the Mazowiecki government?

[Walesa] I used the word war in the figurative sense, in the sense of a democratic parliamentary struggle. The word has been taken out of context.

I supported Mazowiecki, I still support him, and I will continue to support him because he is like Poland—tired, exhausted, distorted, he has difficulty breathing, like Poland. At the same time you cannot help liking him. He is very honest and very loyal. That is why I will support him, but not without criticizing him. As a trade unionist, I see things differently, and on some points I completely disagree with him. But in most cases, I will support him because he is doing his best.

[Meretik] Should Mr. Gorbachev be helped?

[Walesa] I think that Gorbachev is a phenomenon of his time, as was Solidarity and Walesa. In this sense, Gorbachev is a phenomenon. Some say he is a disease of the system, others that he is proof of its health, of the system and his time. Both assessments are correct. It simply depends on the viewpoint of the person speaking. What is certain is that each successor will have to be a new Gorbachev, will have to do the same thing as him, better or not so well, at various rates, at less cost or with more effort. But unless there is a cataclysm, nobody will be able to halt this evolution.

OKP Christian Democrats on Media, Walesa

LD0906055990 Warsaw PAP in English 2139 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Warsaw, June 8—Group of Christian Democrats at the Citizens' Parliamentary Club OKP, composed of 64 deputies and senators, conveyed to PAP a statement in which it expressed its concern "over a tendency in some mass media to present the person of Lech Walesa in a biased way."

It is stressed in the statement that Lech Walesa's great authority and unquestionable position are qualities which should be protected: "One must see them as a guarantee of political order in Poland," deputies and senators stated.

The group also speaks in the statement about Tadeusz Mazowiecki's fundamental importance for the successful progress of reforms in Poland. Authors of the statement are of the opinion that public recognition and confidence, enjoyed by the premier, cause that it would be impossible to overcome, without him, successive dramatic stages of the economic reform in such an orderly and dignified way.

"We are of the opinion that further cooperation between the two statesmen is a commonly expected element of stabilization. It gives poles a sense of security and credibility of transformations taking place in Poland. It relieves one of the necessity to make painful and unwanted selections and divisions."

Result of Lublin By-Election Announced

LD1106142490 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] With regard to matters of national politics, we note that in Lublin the results of a rerun of the senatorial by-elections have been announced. Citizens Committee candidate Jerzy Kloczkowski obtained 50.93 percent of the votes; his opponent Roman Wierzbicki from Private Farmers Solidarity obtained 48.11 percent.

* Centrists Issue Political Platform

90EP0567A Warsaw TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC in Polish No 20, 18 May 90 p 2

["Text" of "Center Agreement Declaration" and list of signatories to the Center Agreement issued in Warsaw on 12 May]

[Text] The passivity and apathy of our society, which are manifested in many areas of the country through elections to the self-government bodies, are increasing. The political and social situation in Poland is approaching a turning point. Either an acceleration in systemic changes bringing

about full democracy, complete independence, and radical ownership transformations in the economy will occur, or the current political system will be preserved, which maintains the communist inheritance and forsakes the opportunity created by many years of struggle by our society, which rallied around the ideas and movement of Solidarity, for freedom and independence.

The roundtable compromise has already become obsolete by now. The operation of the Sejm which is entangled in the interplay of private interests is becoming increasingly difficult. The post-communist nomenklatura hampers the processes of streamlining the economy. Institutional and legal arrangements are incomplete. Under the circumstances, the efforts of Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who enjoys the support of the public, cannot be fully effective.

This cannot go on. We are in favor of a resolute acceleration of systemic changes.

At the moment, international conditions offer us great opportunities. They must be fully taken advantage of.

We, the signatories of the present declaration, functionaries of the Citizens Committees and political groups, come from different communities and have different political orientation. However, we are united by our ties to Solidarity and its ethics of action, deferring to the values of Christian ethics, and the conviction that it is necessary to create a strong political center in Poland as a factor of balance and political innovation.

We support:

—Moving up free elections to the parliament. A new Constitution should be adopted by a new parliament constituted at the latest in the spring of next year through free and democratic elections, a parliament representing the actual balance of political forces in the country.

—Moving up presidential elections. We believe that Poland needs a president who is an actual co-creator of changes. His personality should provide a credible guarantee of resolute implementation of democratic systemic changes. We believe that the candidacy of Lech Walesa who unites our society in a fight for freedom and solidarity would provide such a guarantee.

—A fundamental restructuring of the economy through rapid ownership changes and breaking up the existing monopolies. We believe that arrangements should be introduced which ensure the development of enterprises, industriousness, and capital. The process of privatization should bring about the diffusion of property.

—Speeding up the processes of creating genuine political pluralism.

We believe that the emergence of a vigorous civic society depends on creating the guarantees of pluralism. Citizens Committees which are a part of the extensive and varied Solidarity movement, and political parties and groups should play an important part in shaping it. If the committees were to become an instrument of one political orientation this would endanger the basic sense of systemic changes. The Citizens Committees should facilitate the restoration of a multiparty political system by working out their own positions and opting for various orientations in an unrestricted manner.

—Beginning an open public debate on the direction of constitutional arrangements.

We believe that politics is primarily a public rather than a back-room matter. Public opinion is the proper venue for the maturing of new ideas and new systemic arrangements.

The Center Agreement will resolutely oppose the preservation of special interests and the monopolization of power in Polish politics. The agreement is open to all people and democratic political forces which desire to contribute to creating a center political entity. At the same time, we express our willingness to cooperate with all those who desire to speed up consistently democratic systemic changes in Poland.

List of Signatories to the Agreement of the Center:

Lech Antonowicz, Union of Democrats "Baza"
Andrzej Anusz, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Andrzej Arendarski, Liberal-Democratic Congress, OKP [Citizens Parliamentary Club] deputy
Kazimierz Barczyk, Christian Democracy of Krakow
Jan Bebrysz, Political Dialogue Center
Tomasz Bedynski, Citizens Committee in Gdansk
Ryszard Bender, Labor Party, KIK [Catholic Intellectuals Club] chairman, Lublin
Tadeusz Bien, Democratic Party
Wlodzimierz Bojarski, senator, Republic of Poland
Antoni Borowski, OKP senator, Elblag
Marek Cholewka, Christian Democracy of Krakow
Ireneusz Choroszucha, Citizens Committee in Bialystok
Krzysztof Czabanski, Club '88
Aleksander Czop, KMP [Political Thought Club] "Dziekania"
Slawomir Dabrowski, Political Dialogue Center of the L. Walesa Citizens Committee
Michal Drozdek, Young Christian Democrats
Tadeusz Dziuba, Sejm deputy, Democracy 90
Marek Dziubek, Sejm deputy, OKP, member of the PSL-"S" [Polish Peasant Party-"Solidarity"] Presidium
Jerzy Eysymontt, Democratic Center
Kazimierz Ferenc, Citizens Committee in Rzeszow
Marcin Galec, Democratic Center
Milosz Galecki, Young Christian Democrats
Szymon Gizynski, KMP "Dziekania"
Adam Glapinski, Democratic Center, L. Walesa Citizens Committee
Przemyslaw Hniedziewicz, KMP "Dziekania"
Jerzy Jackl [as published], Democratic Center, L. Walesa Citizens Committee
Jaroslaw Kaczynski, senator, Democratic Forum

Mazowsze
Andrzej Kern, Sejm deputy, OKP
Andrzej Kostarczyk, PSL-"S"
Edmund Krasowski, Sejm deputy, OKP, Elblag
Leonard Krasulski, Agreement of Solidarity Citizens Committees, Elblag
Zbigniew Lech, Sejm deputy, OKP, member of the PSL-"S" Presidium
Janusz Lewandowski, Liberal-Democratic Congress
Edward Lipiec, senator, Zielona Gora
Czeslaw Lipinski, Democratic Center, Legnica
Teresa Liszcz, Sejm deputy, non-party member
Andrzej Machalski, Liberal-Democratic Congress
Jacek Maziarski, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Jerzy Mikke, KMP "Dziekania"
Krzysztof Mularczyk, Independence and Democracy, London
Jerzy Robert Nowak, essayist
Jan Olszewski, L. Walesa Citizens Committee
Jozef Orzel, Club '88
Stanislaw Padykula, Sejm deputy, OKP
Waldemar Pernach, Union of Democrats "Baza"
Andrzej Piatek, Democratic Center, Dzierzoniow
Jerzy Pomin, Political Club August '80
Maciej Poltorak, Sejm deputy, OKP
Andrzej Prokopowicz, KMP "Dziekania"
Stanislaw Rojek, Democratic Center
Kazimierz Rostek, Sejm deputy, OKP, member of the PSL-"S" Presidium
Marek Rutkowski, Sejm deputy, OKP
Tadeusz Rymszewicz, Democratic Party
Slawomir Siwek, editor in chief of TYGODNIK ROLNIKOW SOLIDARNOSC, L. Walesa Citizens Committee
Jaroslaw Sokolowski, PSL-"S", Zielona Gora
Adam Strug, Democratic Center
Grzegorz Strzemecki, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Jaroslaw A. Szczepanski, editor in chief of the A-Z DZIENNIKA OBYWATELSKIEGO
Ryszard Turyk, Voivodship Citizens Committee in Biala Podlaska
Norbert Wojciechowski, member of the Presidium of the Citizens Committee in Lublin
Piotr Wojcik, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Jerzy Zajac, chairman of the Citizens Committee in Czestochowa
Maciej Zalewski, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Rafal Zagorny, Young Chrisitian Democrats
Wieslaw Zielinski, Agreement of Solidarity Citizens Committees in Elblag
Teresa Zimowska, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Fryderyk Zoll, Christian Democracy of Krakow
Krzysztof Zmijewski, Democratic Forum Mazowsze
Jerzy Zurawiecki, Sejm deputy, OKP, Konin Voivodship
Tadeusz Karolak, deputy editor in chief of PRZEGLAD KATOLICKI

Declaration

The liberal and economic circles united in the Liberal-Democratic Congress [KLD] state their desire to contribute to creating the political platform of the center. KLD representatives are signing the Declaration of the Center Agreement with the profound conviction that speeding up systemic changes in Poland is necessary for the complete implementation and success of the economic program of the government, giving a meaning to the current sacrifices of the Polish society.

Further on Dialogue With Hunger Strikers

AU1106154190 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1452 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Political Life: Dialogue Between Government Commission and Representatives of University Square Hunger Strikers and Demonstrators"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—A government commission and representatives of University Square demonstrators and hunger strikers started the dialogue at Victory Palace in Bucharest, on June 11 in the afternoon.

The government is represented by Sever Georgescu, chief of the general secretariat, Radu Dop, deputy minister of health, Lucian Constantinescu from the Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications, Vladimir Pasti, adviser to the prime minister. The hunger strikers and demonstrators are represented by Danut Lungu, Puiu Corneliu and Ovidiu Opilitaru. Attending are also representatives of the People's Alliance and the Romanian Anti- Totalitarian Forum, of the December 16-22 Organization, the Independent Group for Democracy, of the Trade Union of the Arts Academy Students, of the Trade Union of the Institute of Architecture and of the Students' League.

Government Communique on Talks

AU1106195590 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1816 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Dialogue Ends, Demonstrators Assail Government's Building"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—The news agency ROMPRES received a statement from the government's press office on the dialogue held on June 11 between a government commission and representatives of hunger-strikers in Bucharest's University Square. The hunger-strikers' representatives set forth their point of view on the founding of an independent television station, a demand the government's representatives took notice of. Agreement was reached on this matter that it fell within the parliament's competence, and it was shown that the government was backing in principle the creation of several TV stations, independent and private included. The government's representatives promised the hunger-strikers' demands would be met or made known to the competent state power bodies. At the end of the dialogue a protocol was signed after which the hunger-strikers' representatives undertook to end their action.

The dialogue was also attended by representatives of the People's Alliance and "16-21 December" Association who were accompanied by a group of demonstrators. Upon the request of the government's representatives to the dialogue that the group of demonstrators should leave the square to exclude the idea of any pressure upon the course of the talks, the representatives of the two associations agreed to it in the beginning but afterwards they left the room arguing that their political wishes, completely different from the hunger-strikers', were not included in the talks. As a matter of fact political claims are not of the government's competence.

After the representatives of the two associations left the room and the dialogue came successfully to an end, the square demonstrators—representatives of the People's Alliance and the "16-21 December" Association—headed by their leaders, assailed the government's building and the police units that did not use force. Now the situation is at a standstill. The spokesman for the government announced that any similar action would be considered outlawed and appropriate measures would be taken against such shows.

Hunger Strikers' Statement on Dialogue

AU1106195690 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1842 GMT 11 Jun 90

["University Square Strikers' Statement —ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—After the end of the dialogue held at the government's headquarters, the University Square strikers sent the following statement to the news agency ROMPRES:

We who are on hunger strike in University Square inform the public opinion that, following a protocol concluded today with the government's secretary-general, we will cease our hunger strike as we undertook but only when we actually have full authorization for an independent television station.

So far we have obtained only the promise that the government's representatives will support the satisfaction of our demand. Unfortunately, the protocol specifies neither the level at which our demand will be backed nor when it is to be met. We were assured more particularly only that our demand will be supported but not really met.

Consequently, we invite the government to fully trust our promise that we shall end our action when we have the approval of all the competent bodies for the founding an independent and private TV station.

The statement is signed by 19 strikers.

Antigovernment Demonstration in Victory Square

AU1106203290 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1919 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Again Demonstrators in Victory Square"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—While the dialogue was under way between representatives of the government and of hunger- strikers, several hundreds of demonstrators belonging to the "16-21 December" Association, the People's Alliance and the Antitotalitarian

Romanian Front gathered in Victory Square shouting slogans against the country's leadership and for a resolution of their demands. Teodor Maries, vice-president of the People's Alliance, stated: We left the dialogue room because the government's representatives did not allow for the participation of the press, the radio and television. We are here to present our platform of claims, including the dismissal of General Chitac, the truth about the December 16-28, 1989 events and others, at a dialogue also attended by mass media. We do not intend to attack the building nor do we want to have clashes with the numberless policemen and military that are surrounding the building.

The order-keeping forces in front of the government's building were permanently booed by the demonstrators. Meanwhile the truck also came run by its driver who has been on hunger strike for several days. At 8 p.m., local time, the demonstration was on in Victory Square.

Police Intervene 'With Great Brutality'

AU1206113390 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1000 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] The police broke up a antigovernment demonstration yesterday evening [11 June]. Hundreds of armed security officials drove approximately 500 demonstrators away with truncheons. Eyewitnesses report that the police acted with great brutality. According to the authorities, the demonstrators wanted to storm the government building.

Doina Cornea Letter to Iliescu on 'Hunger Martyrs'

AU1106081690 Bucharest ROMANIA LIBERA in Romanian 2 Jun 90 p 1

["Open letter" from Doina Cornea, human rights activist and government critic, to President-elect Ion Iliescu; issued in Cluj on 31 May]

[Text] On 23 May I warned the hunger martyrs in University Square that one can go on a hunger strike only "in front of people to whose love one may appeal." This is what Gandhi used to say. You, together with the whole team of crypto-communists, surely do not belong to that human category. Here are the reasons why.

What can these martyrs expect from people who served communism for so many years and who for a long time practiced abusive methods to preserve or seize power: Demagogy, diversion, disinformation, lies, slanders, and violence? Obviously they cannot expect anything. The cynicism you prove goes to the extent that you not only despise the life of these people and refuse to make an appearance in their midst, but on top of that you put the blame on them when you say that they refuse to accept a dialogue. On 8 May you made the same false statement in connection with the University Square delegates. I saw the latter entering the Parliament with my own eyes at the fixed time and then leaving the Parliament, without having seen your face.

It goes without saying that the University Square martyrs can expect nothing from you!

You, together with the team you preside over, are the ones who have divided the country. Had you not agreed with this "offense" (as Constantin Noica would put it) you would have stopped the transportation of the miners to Bucharest with the aim of creating feuds between people according to social categories; you would have prevented the bloody ethnic clashes in Tirgu Mures; you would have put an end to the false rumors and slanders designed to discredit the democratic forces in our country (had you really been a democrat!) and, more recently, to discredit our most outstanding cultural figures (in this respect you have even outdone Ceausescu, who hardly touched the moral values of writers).

What can the hunger martyrs expect from you?

Obviously, nothing. Because, together with your team, you are the ones who mercilessly have made use of the "revolt of the gentle," of the "children's crusade"—as poets put it—and of their innocent blood to put into practice the plot masterminded beforehand with the help of the KGB, the Securitate in our country, and with the other illegitimate forces in the country. The neutralization of the Securitate, of the prosecutor's office, of the former party nomenklatura and, finally, the acceptance of point 8 of the Timisoara Proclamation would have been the only proof of your political and moral purity. Then you would have been entitled to identify yourself as an "emanation of the revolution"—as you like to call yourself—together with the gentle people who were dying in the bursts of gunfire of those who were confiscating their revolt.

But this did not happen, Mr. Iliescu. At the very beginning of January 1990 almost desperately I was asking you to prove your innocence by restricting, neutralizing the Securitate, and by not accepting them in decision-making positions. Just recall our last telephone conversation a week prior to my withdrawing from the Front!

Were I in your place these days I would shake with terror before the innocent lives in University Square. These lives, nine in number, hardly pulsate any more, Mr. Iliescu, and yet only you would be able to save them through an act of truth, justice, and humaneness.

I want you to know that my whole love is on their side. I am convinced that our country will not forget its heroes, martyrs, and that the day will come when history will be grateful to them.

Doina Cornea

Post scriptum: I avail myself of this opportunity to express indignation at Mr. Alexandru Paleologu's recall from his position of ambassador. You send the pure ones about their business, you protect the former Securitate and activists: Your policy is clear.

Cluj, 31 May 1990

More on Interior, Defense Ministries Controversy

AU1106151090 Bucharest ADEVARUL in Romanian 6 Jun 90 p 3

[Editorial note: "Clarification"]

[Text] One of the "central" dailies yesterday hastened to publish a fresh communique issued by the "Action Committee for the Democratization of the Army." The seriousness of this initiative to make the Army's intrinsic problems public is confirmed by the promptness with which the leadership of the ministry in question—the Interior Ministry—is reacting. During the afternoon our editorial staff received a communique on behalf of this ministry, a summary of which—given the seriousness of the situation thus created—we believe we should present to our readers:

Upon the request of some commanders in Bucharest and in the provinces, on 5 June 1990 the Higher Management Council of the Ministry of Interior met to examine the contents and aim of the communique of the Action Committee for the Democratization of the Army published in ROMANIA LIBERA on the same date.

The council unanimously noted that the authors of the communique take the liberty—without being familiar with the facts—to slander the activity of a ministry—closely linked to our country's socioeconomic activity—which is known and appreciated by all our homeland's citizens.

The authors of the communique ignore the fact that more than 1,300 compromised cadres have been removed from the leadership apparatus of the Ministry of Interior, while all management cadres of the central apparatus and more than 60 percent of the management cadres in regional units have been replaced.

The Ministry of Interior recorded 186 dead and wounded during the revolution, people who had fought to defend achievements and aims of the revolution and the citizens' interests.

During the period immediately following the revolution, more than 1,000 revolutionaries from among the young people were employed to replace the compromised cadres; these young people are now carrying out their activity in police units, the fire department, and the other branches, while all command cadres are appointed democratically within the collectives.

One might say that the democratization of the Interior Ministry apparatus has been accomplished without street demonstrations but with the adherence of an overwhelming majority of the troops.

Since the revolution, the Ministry of Interior cadres have uncovered more than 20,000 offenses and have participated in extinguishing 2,031 fires, saving property valued at more than 200 million lei.

The Higher Management Council of the Ministry of Interior asks itself: What entitles the authors of the communique in question to speak about a change of the minister of interior and the appointment of another? Since when may cadres of another ministry—under the current democratic conditions—appoint the leaders of another ministry? Such practices remind us of a period of sad remembrances when a handful of people decided the fate of one or another institution. Never have the cadres of the Ministry of Interior taken the liberty to examine and to propose the change of the minister of national defense.

Bearing in mind that the current minister of interior, Colonel- General Mihai Chitac, was seen by the whole population asking the military units and those of the Ministry of Interior to withdraw to the barracks and to abstain from the use of acts of aggression against the population, the Higher Management Council of the Ministry of Interior views it as opportune to preserve this position. We ask the management of the Ministry of National Defense to make known its position toward the communique of the Committee for the Democratization of the Army.

Article Calls on Government To Be More Open

AU1206092890 Bucharest ADEVARUL in Romanian 7 Jun 90 p 1

[Magdalena Boiangiu article: "A Carte Blanche"]

[Text] The leadership of the National Salvation Front [NSF] assumed a great responsibility when it promised, during the electoral campaign, a nonviolent change of the structures of the dictatorship. Peaceful—this was the key word that motivated the majority vote. By peacefulness one probably meant the need to judge and decide while fully cognizant of the facts and to choose our course of evolution in the near future through a careful examination of the past and by clearly defining the present's potential. The fact that a radical change of structures cannot happen overnight has been proved even by Romania's tragic experience: Although supported by the victorious Soviet troops, although ready to physically destroy any adversary and eliminate any group of opponents from public life, and although the model they opted for had been precisely defined, the communists also needed several years to effectively take over power and use it efficiently, in order to establish their dictatorship. As long as there is a consensus on eliminating the possibility of a bloody conflict between those who suffered and those who made them suffer, we must accept the prospect of an obviously antagonistic coexistence between an apparatus which must give up power, on the one hand, and the realities imposed by the process of democratization and free initiative and by the social forces searching for a balance and a raison d'etre in a value system guaranteeing truth, on the other.

Will the Front manage to guarantee and accelerate this process? The quickest answer is "no," and the avalanche of post-election reproaches exploits the suspicion and distrust created, seeing everywhere plots and scenarios

for disaster. Mr. Iliescu is being faced with many ultimatums and the conditions put to him are so drastic that they practically amount to requests for unconditional surrender. It is hard to imagine that this capitulation will occur after such a massive endorsement at the ballot. Therefore, the open letters remain unanswered, which does not mean, however, that some of the questions raised do not leave their shadow of doubt as far as the public is concerned.

Since the elections, the powers that be have been silent. We are entitled to assume that it is preparing its future directions of attack. But are we, those who voted for or against it, not also entitled to know what these directions are? Very many independent candidates were included in the Front's electoral list. Maybe this choice was no mere tribute to current fashion, but also an expression of a certain aloofness toward a political group's program, which is accepted in general, but not in certain specific points. What are these points?

Some say that in view of the numerical weakness of the declared parliamentary opposition, the natural course of a democratic political life will be ensured by the opposition within the Front. But who represents this opposition and what exactly does it want? There was talk about a coalition government. What stage have negotiations reached? There was talk about a government of experts. Who are they? We cannot find any answers either in the Front's press or from any other public sources. Mr. Iliescu once said that he does not like publicity. This is very well, but publicity has nothing to do with the public character of the political life, which the electorate has a right to hope for.

Freedom of information and opinion not only means anybody's right to state his opinion about the activity of the power center, but also implies the obligation of the power center to inform us regarding all its intentions. Decisions behind closed doors, no matter how noble their premises may be, can only scare one, and on good grounds. Even if the old nomenklatura is removed, secrecy within political life will give birth to a new "party oligarchy," with new privileges and dictatorial habits. In the form in which it has emerged after the elections, the parliamentary opposition cannot efficiently control the majority. In order to reassure us that it is determined to break with the past, this majority must willingly subject itself to the control of those who gave it a carte blanche.

Journalist Paler's Sincerity Questioned

AU0706100990 Bucharest LIBERTATEA in Romanian 29 May 90 p 4

[N.Gh. Cristian article: "Romanians' Curse Is Yalta, While Mr. Paler's Curse Is Brucan"]

[Text] The roundtable discussion organized by the BBC on Monday night [28 May] featured Mr. Octavian Paler and Mr. Sorin Dumitrescu from the Group for Social Dialogue (GDS) as guests and drew a number of conclusions in connection with the election results and the unsurprising victory of the National Salvation Front [FSN], however surprising the degree of the victory may have been. Mr. Paler believes that the Romanians are haunted by the curse of Yalta. I do not know to what extent the Romanians are haunted by this curse. However, I do know that Mr. Paler and the entire GDS are haunted by the curse of Brucan.

When, at the beginning of the year, the report about the "stupid people"—an expression attributed to Mr. Brucan—emerged, the paper whose honorary director is Mr. Paler took the most virulent position and this indignation was shared by the newspaper "22"—the GDS organ—and others. Before, during, and after the elections, however, Mr. Paler and the GDS have taken up virtually the same idea and are saying that, in essence, the Romanian electorate—its overwhelming majority—is being disinformed, ignored, and has no political awareness.

In the aforementioned roundtable discussion it was said that until 22 December the Romanians dreamt only about the despot being replaced by a more benevolent one, and nobody dared aspire to anything more than that. A very few woke up after 22 December and realized that the revolution had brought them freedom and not only the fall of a cruel tyrant. Some realized this fact only after a few days, while it took others two weeks or three months to realize it. However, the majority (is it necessary to recall the proportion by which Iliescu and the FSN won the elections?) did not become aware of this fact at all, not even on 20 May—the GDS guests said at the roundable. Along this line, the 20 May vote also confirmed that the December revolution was an anti-Ceausescu and not an anticommunist one. Is this not a theory borrowed precisely from Professor Brucan, a theory that recently was still being rejected—with the usual indignation and force—by Mr. O. Paler and company, the GDS?

One can only find the proper terms for this surprising mental pirouette by examining the rage with which Mr. Paler and the GDS have constantly fired accusations at Mr. Iliescu to the effect that what he stated yesterday is denied (by the same Mr. Iliescu) today and, therefore, what he says today will most certainly be denied (by the same person) tomorrow. Thus, Mr. Paler's sincere plea for truth and his indignation about lies are understandable....

Paler Deplores Ambassador Paleologu's Discharge

AU1006205590 Bucharest ROMANIA LIBERA in Romanian 2 Jun 90 p 1

[Octavian Paler article: "A Missed Chance"]

[Text] Strictly speaking, the discharge from office of our ambassador, Alexandru Paleologu, in Paris seems to have been done with good reason. Placing the interests of Romania above the interests of power and convinced that the country and the Romanian people are more important than a provisional administration, Alexandru

Paleologu did indeed make some statements which did not please the government at all. Why not admit it: It is not normal diplomatic procedure for an ambassador to publicly depart from the instructions of the government that has entrusted him with his mission. However, how do things stand in a broader sense? For a long time now Romania has not had a representative, an intellectual of Alexandru Paleologu's stature, who is able to do a tremendous service to his country and to immensely boost its credit through his own personality. For a few months Paris has seen an ambassador who, through his intelligence, culture, and intellectual charm, stood out. I suppose, in diplomatic circles in the French capital, a completely special capital, where numerous values fade because of the competition, while mediocrities do not attract anyone's attention unless they are ridiculous. What a chance for Romania to have such an exceptional figure on the banks of the Seine! What a chance to actually get closer to the great figures of France and to prove to the technocrats in French foreign business (and not only to them) that at the gate to the Orient there are partners who are capable of more than just enumerating worn cliches! What a chance for us to demonstrate that the revolution has radically changed mentalities in Bucharest, that respect for the right to truth and values can by placed—even if others do not do that—above diplomatic regulations! What a chance for the Romanian Government to prove that it can be above vanities and its own views when the country gains in prestige (and not only that)! Unfortunately, this chance was missed. Mutatis mutandis, one probably has to be Napoleon to accept an ambassador who does not always agree with you and whose name is Talleyrand. Now the government has calmed down; it is no longer waiting with emotion for the cables from Paris, but something—maybe even more important than the peace of the government—has been lost. Diplomatic usages and statutes have regained their rights, but how can we forget that an uncomfortable asset is more precious than mediocre discipline? And then, is the condition of being a weather vane part of discipline? He who peruses the lists of the ambassadors appointed since the revolution, and especially in the past months (this was partially done, I think, by ZIG-ZAG review), is faced with a disturbing revelation. Maybe one day this should be discussed. For the time being, I have dealt with an exception that has been corrected.

Further on Market Economy Transition Strategy

AU0806214390 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1911 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 8/6/1990—The second chapter on economic and financial conditions shows that the basic condition for transition to the market economy is the decision-making autonomy of economic agents which is in turn closely related to ownership.

Direct responsibility, on the grounds of ownership, of the economic agents is essential to set the market economy mechanisms into motion: it implies a direct and explicit relationship between the owned object (through its elements—ownership, use, disposal usufruct) and the individual members of society. This is the principal substance of privatization. This is a complex process that is achieved in many ways. Of them, the following can be considered:

a. Auctioning state units to private persons or entrepreneurial groups. For that end, giant monopoly-like enterprises can split to be set on an economic basis to meet the demands for competition.,

b. Turning state units into share-holding companies, with shares being sold partially or wholly—on the market, the employees of the respective enterprise being given preferential terms;

c. Encouraging the creation of new private units whose activity is not limited, with new equipment as well as with fixed capital bought from state units;

d. Licensing or leasing in various forms state units that can eventually be bought by entrepreneurs.

These way are open to both Romanian and foreign entrepreneurs.

The following categories of state enterprises are regarded as exempted from privatisation:

—In a "minimal" variant: power units., certain extractive units; part of agricultural units and of the forestland; the basic transport and telecommunications systems; the basic health care, education and social security infrastructure;

—In a "maximal" variant, adding to the above are all extractive units, certain sub-branches and large units in the metal, machine- building, chemical, construction materials and other industries.

The following are regarded as the main ways to provide the capital for privatisation:

—the savings of the population;
—long-term credits on easy terms to buy stocks or enterprises;
—free allocation to citizens of shares or other property bonds for part of the capital of state enterprises;
—foreign investment. The governmental commission regards the re-equipment of industry and of other branches, a marked growth of the high-technology industries, a growing competitiveness of the Romanian economy in international markets as priorities of foreign investment.

For economic units to actually pass from the state to the private sector a number of legal, organizational, financial and other measures should be taken to:

—make the managerial staff and the entrepreneurs aware of the rules of the market economy;
—develop an openness to the market economy;

—create institutions (development bank, consulting offices etc.) to support the establishment of private economic units that should duly consider the market;
—set up specialized institutions;
—adopt anti-monopoly laws and enact documents especially a code of trade and the bankruptcy law.

In the course of 1990 privatisation could be achieved in broad outline in trade, tourism, other services, in the lesser industrial units. The share of the state sector could drop to 30-40 per cent of the accumulated national wealth, that of private sector rise accordingly (the structure of property being comparable with that of certain advanced European states).

Transition to the market economy requires a sharp change of substance of the state property in those areas where it will be maintained on the basis of the decentralization of the economic management.

Some of the state units should comply with all the rigors of the market economy, and observe the laws of competition along with all private units (cooperatives included).

Other state units, to be named state-controlled units, supplying services of general interest, are subject to the market economy mechanisms with certain particularities; among them are the power systems, basic transport, telecommunications, etc.

As concerns the land the chief means of production in agriculture the privatisation process has gained scope in the course of 1990.

Individual farmsteads account for nearly 3.7 million hectares of farmland, of which 2.6 million hectares of arable land owned or leased for a long term.

Cooperative farms own 6.9 million hectares of agricultural land.

Overall, farmers own or have under a long-term lease 10.7 million hectares of farmland, or 72 per cent of the country's agricultural area.

The state sector has 4.1 million hectares of farmland, of which 1.9 million hectares of arable area.

The Government Commission recommends that the land law be enacted in the course of 1990 in order to solve the ownership problem in a unitary way.

Iliescu Views Market Economy in Japanese Interview

AU1106173590 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1648 GMT 11 Jun 90

["Transition to the Market Economy Essence of the Reform To Be Made in Romania"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—The transition from a centralized economy to the market economy is the essence of the reform to be made in Romania, stated President Ion Iliescu in an interview he granted to a group of reporters representing the leading dailies and television channels in Japan.

In President Iliescu's opinion this is the most complex and most difficult problem in the ensuing period taking into account that a definitive end should be put to an overcentralized system based on administrative management, on the broad assertion of the arbitrary, of subjectivism in making economic decisions and on the ignorance of basic economic laws.

The programme to implement economic reforms includes measures regarding the ownership over the means of production considering that all the forms of property should coexist and foreign capital- based joint companies should be promoted, while decisions should be made by basic economic units so as to achieve decentralization.

As for the market-plan relationship, Ion Iliescu opines that forms and levers must be found out to elaborate the socioeconomic development strategy of the country by taking far-reaching major and non-administrative plans as a basis. President Iliescu also specified that action would be taken to achieve financial levers apt to protect the national economy while integrating it into the world economy, and to stimulate private initiative and the flexibility of units and individuals by protecting the main categories of working people and the unprivileged strata of society.

Prosecutor's Office Dismisses Prosecutor Mirescu

AU0906214590 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1723 GMT 8 Jun 90

["Justice—An Act of Justice in the Area of Justice"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 8/6/1990—The Steering College of Romania's Prosecutor's Office decided to dismiss Prosecutor Dan-Ioan Mirescu for "serious violations of professional deontology, which made him incompatible with his capacity as a prosecutor," a communique released by the Press Bureau of the Prosecutor's Office, printed in the newspaper ROMANIA LIBERA, shows. The communique lists a number of violations Dan-Ioan Mirescu committed showing him to fail to meet the criteria of professional competence and the moral authority needed for the Prosecutor's Office.

So, for instance, he kept Gheorghe Samoilescu under arrest and sent him to court on charges of murder, rape, burglary and defilement of a dead body though he had testimony proving the former's lack of guilt. Consequently, Gheorghe Samilescu spent almost three years in prison until the true author of the crime, committed on victim Ana Broscotean, in Sibiu, was found.

NPCDP Members Excluded from Party

AU1106115390 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1114 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 22/6/1990—A communique printed on 10 June in DREPTATEA shows that the Bureau of the Standing Delegation of the National Peasant Christian Democratic National Party [NPCDP] discussed on 8 June Mr. Ion Puiu's involvement in the action of the group of young people that belonged to an organization dissolved for serious violations of discipline and morality, just as for his attempt at imposing on the party a personal line through pressure, and decided to dismiss him from the office of NPCDP vice-president.

Likewise, the bureau of the NPCDP standing delegation decided to exclude another 12 members of the party. It is specified that those excluded, members of the former auxiliary youth organization, dissolved by the Standing Delegation's Bureau, adopted a rebellious attitude, speaking of behalf of the party's leadership through false communiques, tried to occupy the party's main headquarters by force resorting to forces outside the party.

Dimitru Dinca Excluded From People's Alliance

AU1106180190 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1729 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—The provisional committee of the National Council of People's Alliance excluded Dumitru Dinca from the office of vice president and from the organization's membership. He entered into a conflict with the leadership of the Christian and Democratic National Peasant Party at its headquarters while heading a group of demonstrators, shows a statement published by daily "DREPTATEA."

The statement also mentions that members of the Alliance leadership, analysing Dinca Dumitru's attitude (he claims to be one of the University Square demonstrators' leaders) found him guilty of having violated the organization's statute, committed abuses and made decisions that do not comply with the Alliance's ideas, one of his most serious deviations being "his links with members of political parties." Dinca refused to exculpate himself tabling his resignation which was approved.

Timisoara Supreme Court Trial Continues

AU1106180290 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1725 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—In Timisoara the Supreme Court of Justice, Military Section, continues the trial of defendants Ion Coman, Cornel Pacoste, Ilie Matei and Radu Balan as well as of other 21 defendants, former cadres of the secret police and militia charged with the crime of genocide, complicity and abetment of this crime as well as with other penal offences committed during the December 1989 revolution.

During the last two sessions Florea Sofronie, Teodora Avram and Vasile Balog, ex-secretaries of the Timis County Party Committee, were heard as witnesses of the events. They brought further evidence of the decisions made to stifle the revolution in Timisoara and to repress the demonstrators, full truth being thus established about the events last December.

The process continues Tuesday, June 12, 1990, with the hearing of other witnesses.

More on Trial of Andruta Ceausescu, Others

AU1206111090 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1000 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] At the Supreme Court of Justice Military Section the trial continues for defendants Ion Coman, Cornel Pacoste, Ilie Matei, and Radu Balan, as well as for the other 21 defendants, former members of the Securitate and militia, on charges of genocide, complicity, and assistance in committing the aforesaid crimes, and for other crimes committed during the December 1989 revolution. Nicolae Andruta Ceausescu's trial also resumes today in Bucharest.

Prosecutor General on Revolution, Defendants

AU0906214990 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1737 GMT 8 Jun 90

["Justice—Statement by the Prosecutor General Five Months After the Revolution"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 8/6/1990—According to data available at present 1,033 people died—of which 540 in Bucharest—and 2,198 people were wounded—of which 1,040 in Bucharest owing to attempts to reprimand the revolution, said Romania's Prosecutor General, Mr. Gheorghe Robu, in an interview with the newspaper DIMINEATA. He added that the material damage, which was very heavy, indeed, could not be assessed accurately as yet.

As to the acts of repression during the revolution, Mr. Gheorghe Robu said that so far 1,211 cases, involving 1,447 offenders, had been sent to the military prosecutor's bodies. As many as 101 causes, involving 279 offenders, were solved, 74 defendants being sent to court—23 of them have already been sentenced. Another 1,100 cases, involving 1,173 offenders, are under investigation—75 or the offenders are under arrest. There are ten generals Iulian Vlad, Ilie Ceausescu, Aristotel Stamatoiu, Geanu Bucurescu, Aurelian Moltoiu, Alexandru Tencu, Gheorghe Danescu, Ion Mot, Marin Neagoe and Gheorghe Vasile among the defendants now under arrest.

Answering a question as to the terrorists and their trials, the prosecutor general said: there were people who shot at the civilians and they will be tried. We have already sent a number of individuals who shot at the demonstrators to court and some of them have already been sentenced. Not all those who shot at the demonstrators

were arrested but I am sure all the guilty individuals will be eventually put under arrest, Mr. Robu said, adding that for the time being it was quite difficult to say when the "files of the revolution" were to be solved, though that was the main concern of the prosecutor's bodies.

Daily Provides Figures on Revolution Casualities

AU1006172090 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1600 GMT 10 Jun 90

["The Victims of the Acts To Repress the Revolution"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 10/6/1990—Quoting sources of the Prosecutor General's Office, the newspaper "DIMINEATA" of June 10 informs its readers that as many as 1,033 people were killed and another 2,198 were wounded throughout Romania.

Until December 22, 144 people were killed and 727 were wounded. Another 889 people were killed and 1,471 wounded in the days that followed, the newspaper also shows.

The number of dead and wounded persons in Bucharest stood at 540 and, respectively, 1,040. There were 97 people killed and 210 wounded in Timisoara, while the number of killed and wounded persons stood at 93 and, respectively, 208 in Sibiu, 61 and, respectively, 108 in Brasov, 40 and, respectively, 97 in Braila, 26 and, respectively, 50 in Cluj, 25 and, respectively, 56 in Buzau and 13 and, respectively, 28 in Tirgoviste.

One hundred and thirty-eight people were killed and 401 were wounded in the other localities of the country.

'Hooligans' Break Into Journal's Headquarters

AU1106172890 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1651 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—A group of hooligans broke in and devastated the headquarters of the "ROMANIA MARE" ["GREATER ROMANIA"] review in Bucharest, on June 11, 1990. Writers Eugen Barbu and Corneliu Vadim Tudor, who edit the review, are inclined to believe it was about an attempt of intimidation directly connected with the slandering campaign against the review.

The police currently investigate the circumstances.

Free Exchange Party Holds Meeting

AU1006172590 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1547 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 10/6/1990—On Sunday Bucharest venued the first meeting of the Free Exchange Party which discussed its steering committee's report on the results of the May 20 elections and the party's current tasks, as well as a report on the current financial situation and the use of the funds allotted by the government for the election campaign. Guidelines of action were also agreed upon. Emphasis was placed on the fact that in the wake of the May 20 elections the Free Exchange Party had gained a seat in the country's parliament. The party will be represented by its chairman, Mr. Stefan Cazimir, who, in his opening address, emphasized the values his party promotes: reliability and a sense of humour, a critical spirit released from complexes, a sincere attitude in all circumstances. Vice-chairman George Barna highlighted the fact that the party had spent nothing of the 750,000 lei the government gave them for the campaign. The money was deposited in a savings bank to make profits from interest rates.

During the talks, organizational questions such as headquarters, fees, membership cards, propaganda materials as well as issues relative to the editing of a Free Exchange Party publication in every county and the promotion of the spirit of initiative from bottom to top were also tackled.

Craiova Meeting for Better Supplies, Transport

AU0806102190 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0911 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 8/6/1990—Better living conditions, better supply and public transport, the eradication of corruption, profiteering and parasitism are some of the claims forwarded by the about 5,000 trade unionists of several enterprises and institutions in Craiova that took part in a meeting in the National Theatre Square on Thursday afternoon. There were no incidents. These problems of a social character referring to the Craiova residents' higher standards of living and civilization in harmony with the new political and economic conditions created by the victorious 1989 December revolution were previously discussed by the organizers of the meeting, representatives of free trade unions of 13 enterprises, in a joint meeting on June 4 and 5.

The participants in the meeting adopted a petition and requested the local authorities to work out a programme of measures till June 15, this year, for the resolution of the Craiova trade unions' claims.

Domestic Trade Minister on Price Hike 'Rumors'

AU0906210090 Bucharest ADEVARUL in Romanian 1 Jun 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Domestic Trade Minister Em. V. Dobrescu by Nicolae Militaru; place and date not given: "Situation of Prices in Trade"]

[Text] [Militaru] Mr. Minister, discussions continue on a so-called program for a general increase in prices. What can you tell us about all these rumors?

[Dobrescu] It is not for the first time that people have launched such rumors. What is surprising, however, is the fact that many people take these rumors and amplify them, forgetting that next to us, in the street—in both

Bucharest and the provinces—outright aberrant prices are asked for under-the-counter goods. The reason for this surely lies in the acute lack of goods. As a result of this situation, the government has approved important funds for importing the products needed to ensure appropriate commodity stocks and a diversity of goods on the market. Many of the products belonging to the category of luxury items have never been on the shelves of our stores, while others have not been available for 10 to 15 years. Naturally, prices were set in accordance with the new conditions of the market economy, which means taking account of supply and demand. On the other hand, in order to prevent imported goods from being taken abroad where, as is well known, they were sold—to the detriment of our citizens, for whom these goods were very difficult or often impossible to find—by various people at most favorable prices for their own purse, we tried to be in line with the level of prices in those countries.

[Militaru] In concrete terms, we would like to know what products you are talking about and what their prices are in state trade stores.

[Dobrescu] For instance we will sell whisky in our stores. The price of such a bottle is between 400 and 900 lei, depending on the brand, age, and the country of origin. Other fine liquors such as "Cinzano," "Martini," "Ricadona" are sold for 250 lei a bottle. This price matches the prices in other countries, without, however, meaning an increase in the price, because such liquors have been absent from our market for years and years, and we have almost no point of reference. The same holds true for foreign cigarettes. The most varied brands are now put on the market and their prices per packet are as follows: Dunhill—90 lei; Kent—80 lei; Marlboro—90 lei; H.B.—70 lei; and Bastos—60 lei. It is common knowledge that such cigarettes have not been available for years on end in our trade and, bearing in mind that on the free market—so to say—130 to 150 lei were paid for one packet of such cigarettes, one cannot talk of an increase in price. Similarly, as far as cigarettes from Eastern countries are concerned—BT, DS, Apollonia—or liquors such as Cuban rum or instant coffee—because only this type has been mentioned—the current prices only match those in all neighboring countries and permit us to sell such products under civilized conditions and not, for instance, in the street, where traffickers end up with great sums of money in their pockets for which they have not worked.

[Militaru] We understand that the possibility of being able from now on to buy special products in our stores, which up to now were available only to certain people or to those who were able to buy them "on the black market," so to say, instead of pleasing us has shocked some people....

[Dobrescu] That is what it seems like, but I want to repeat there is no increase in prices; we only put on the market special products of superior quality at market prices, of course. From now on we should not be surprised that the market will be the one to dictate prices. However, we are not talking of a program of increasing the prices of basic consumer goods; all our goods—bread, milk, meat, eggs, cheese, butter, sugar, edible oil or products similar to the imported ones, such as cigarettes and liquors—will be sold at current prices. Therefore, any other information in connection with this question is false.

Contracts With Foreign Trade Partners

AU1106154390 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1430 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 11/6/1990—Romania has recently concluded important contracts with firms abroad. The Uzinimportexport has concluded a contract with a firm in Sweden that stipulates the delivery of high-accuracy cast parts for microhydroelectric power plants worth 600,000 dollars. Negotiations are on with a firm in Spain for the selling of important amounts of Romanian stainless sheets.

The Daimler Benz sent a delegation to visit the Aro enterprise in Cimpulung Muscel, the Brasov lorry works, the Bucharest bus and [word indistinct] works in view of establishing cooperation in the production of lorries, heavy engines and cars.

The Romanian foreign trade company has concluded an accord with Exhimbank Turkey to credit Romanian import of Turkish goods worth 50 million dollars.

Contracts were concluded in the latter half of May on export of iron-and-steel goods, furniture, oil products, ready-mades, etc. to Federal Germany, the Netherlands and Italy.

Cooperation Agreement With EEC Expected

AU1106114590 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1433 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Brussels (ROMPRES) 11/6/1990—Negotiations were conducted in Brussels on an agreement on commerce, commercial and economic cooperation between Romania and the EEC. The document was initialed and is to be signed soon. It opens wide prospects for the expansion of Romania's economic relations with the EEC countries in domains of mutual interest: Commerce, transport, telecommunications, energy, health, tourism.

Iliescu, Roman Receive SPD Parliamentarians

AU1106173390 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1531 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—Romania's president elect, Ion Iliescu received on June 11 the delegation of the parliamentary fraction of the Social-Democratic Party of Federal Germany, led by Dr.

Herman Scheer, member of the foreign policy commission of the parliament, chairman of the SDP fraction's working group on disarmament and armament control.

The delegation was outlined the process of democratization and opening of the Romanian society that started in December 1989, the actions being taken for Romania's integration in Europe and world's political, economic and cultural life.

In turn, the West-German parliamentarians said they were ready to give the new Romanian government, the Romanian people support toward the country's democratization.

Petre Roman, prime minister, was present at the interview.

After that, Herman Scheer, head of the delegation, made a brief statement to the Romanian press: "I talked thoroughly with Romania's president and with the prime minister, who referred mainly to the ways by which Romania would be able to more rapidly integrate in Europe. President Iliescu's effort to rid Romania of its isolation and embark upon an open way is very important. This new way will have to be supported by all of us."

Romanian Delegation From Hungary Visits

AU0706165290 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1256 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 7/6/1990—A news conference was held in Bucharest on June 7 during the visit to Romania of a delegation of the Democratic Union of Romanians in Hungary. The president of the union, also president of the nationalities in Hungary, Mr. Gheorghe Mihailescu, and Mr. Gheorghe Petrosani, member of the union's presidium, head of the Romanian language and literature department in Szeged, spoke about their contacts with representatives of the Romanian Ministries of Culture, Education and Religious Affairs, and about the union's activity and the history of the [words indistinct] the union's wish to contribute to a better knowledge of the Romanian people's history.

The guests also answered the journalists' questions.

The news conference was attended by the Hungarian ambassador to Bucharest, other members of the embassy and representatives of the Romanian Ministry of Culture.

More on Romanian Minority Visit

AU0706173190 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1601 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 7/6/1990—The president of the Democratic Union of the Romanians in Hungary and of the Union of the Nationalities in Hungary, Mr. Gheorghe Mihaescu, and Mr. Gheorghe Petrusan, head of the Romanian Language and Literature Department at the Szegedin Institute, met at Hungary's Embassy in Bucharest on Thursday with Romanian journalists. "The possibility to visit our mother-country represents an important moment in our lives. We have been opened a gate we could also get through," Gheorghe Mihaescu said. Reference was made to the situation of the Romanians living in Hungary, their possibilities to use their mother tongue in all- grade education. The delegation had interviews with the minister of culture, Andrei Plesu, with the minister of education, Mihail Sora, as well as with the minister of religious affairs, Nicolae Stoicescu.

"The purpose of our visit Mr. Gheorghe Petrusan said is to obtain moral and material-cultural support, to make known the Romanian people's history and culture to the Romanians in Hungary."

Answering the journalists' questions, the members of the delegation detailed on the education system in the mother tongue in the Romanian-populated areas, on the information system by means of the press, radio and television benefited by the Romanian population in Hungary. So, the television broadcasts 5-minute news bulletins in Romanian every week and a 30-minute programme twice a month, while the radio broadcasts 30-minute programmes three times a week on Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday.

As regards the higher education it is restricted only to the training of the staff necessary for the teaching of Romanian language in schools pedagogues, school-teachers, professors. A still unsolved question but with great chances to be solved until the end of this month is the representation of the Romanian minority in the parliament. "The nationalities Mr. Gheorghe Petrusan said should greatly contribute to the strengthening of relations, they should not be used as tools, as means of discussions and treaties among states. The nationalities are the extended arms of a nation and through them contribution can be made to better cooperation and understanding among peoples."

Romanian, Bulgarian Environment Ministers Meet

AU1006172290 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1544 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 10/6/1990—Upon an invitation extended by the minister of waters, forests and the environment of Romania, Mr. Simion Hancu, an interview took place in Bucharest on Saturday, June 9, between the Romanian minister and Mr. Aleksandur Aleksandrov, minister of environmental conservation of Bulgaria. The interview, which was attended by the deputy ministers, experts and the heads of the ecological movements in the two countries, focused on questions related to environmental protection in border areas.

In connection with the problem concerning the pollution with chloride of the town of Ruse, which was raised during the interview, the Romanian delegation showed that the chloride products manufacturing site of the chemical combine of Giurgiu had been closed as early as 1988.

According to measurements performed in the Romanian territory, the concentration of chloride and hydrochloric acid in the area over the said interval was not exceeded.

The Romanian delegation requested the closing of the four large generator sets of the nuclear power plant at Kozloduy, that run the risk of a nuclear accident. It was agreed that the two delegations meet again to jointly solve environmental-protection affairs in the area, as well as issues related to the nuclear power plant at Belene, on the Danube.

Margaritescu Visits Cuba, Discusses Ties

AU1106180090 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1727 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 11/6/1990—Romanian Foreign Trade Minister Alexandru Margaritescu made an official visit in Cuba. He was received by Fidel Castro Ruz, president of the State Council and of the Council of Ministers, and conducted talks with the Cuban foreign minister.

The visit was an opportunity to investigate the current stage and prospects of the bilateral relations. Both parties expressed interest in the amplification of the commercial exchanges and bilateral economic cooperation. Measures were agreed on the implementation of the contract economic provisions for the current year and work modalities were established for commercial exchanges starting 1991. Discussions with executives of economic ministries led to the singling out of new possibilities of collaboration in machine-building, electrical engineering, iron-and-steel and food industries.

1,526,000 Passports Issued to Romanians

AU0806170190 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1602 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 8/6/1990—Any Romanian citizen has the right to and can, not only theoretically like in the past, travel abroad, certainly, by abiding by the law, stated General Manea Gheorghe, chief of the General Passports department of Romania, with the daily DREPTATEA. Till the end of May, he specified, 1,526,000 passports were issued in comparison with 450,000 last year. In May alone, for instance, we issued 286,000 passports on a national level and other 750,000 are in work. Over January 1-May 28, 2,698,428 Romanian citizens travelled abroad as to 316,887 in the same interval last year. We are doing our best to meet all demands. No refusal was made to any person. Over January 1-April 30, 1990, for example, 51,320 requests for definitively leaving Romania, especially for West Germany and the U.S.A., as well as for Israel, Australia, Canada, France were approved. Another 40,000 applications are to be solved soon. There was no case of refusing a visa to any applicant and there will be none of the like.

Slovene Defense Minister on Army's Future

AU1206142090 Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 3 Jun 90 p 7

[Interview with Janez Jansa, republican secretary for Slovene National Defense, by Stipe Mijic; place and date not given: "Janez Jansa, Minister Without an Army"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Mijic] How do you, as the Slovene defense minister, see future relations in Yugoslavia?

[Jansa] The first thing that we should do is adopt a new constitution for the Republic of Slovenia and a law on a confederal system in Yugoslavia. We think that it is possible to reach such an agreement. If a political agreement, however, is not reached, then Yugoslavia will inevitably break up as a federal state.

[Mijic] If Yugoslavia is going to break up, when will this happen?

[Jansa] We are not talking about a long period, but within one to one and half years at most. This moment is coming closer and closer, and everybody in Yugoslavia is facing the same problem, not just us Slovenes. [passage omitted]

[Mijic] How much, according to your information, is Slovenia paying for the Army at present? If it is true that 68 percent of the funds for the Army come from Slovenia and Croatia, and that the percentage of the Serbian officer cadre in the Army is the same, then all complaints about the talks concerning the Army's budget are understandable.

[Jansa] According to the information gathered by previous assembly commissions, I think that something over seven percent of the national income of Slovenia is paid to the Army. This is almost four times more than what would be normal. This money could be better spent on more profitable projects than on piling up military equipment. Defense should be seen in broader terms, because if a big military budget is affecting the economy, then this is weakening rather than strengthening the defense capability of society as a whole. The percentage or share of the two republic's contributions is presumably correct.

[Mijic] Is it possible to organize a Slovene Army as quickly as you think Yugoslavia is going to disintegrate?

[Jansa] Yes. It is possible to very quickly organize the Slovene Army for the defense of Slovenia's independence, which would be endangered by Yugoslavia's disintegration.

[Mijic] Would you also consider the Slovene officer cadre in the Yugoslav People's Army?

[Jansa] Of course. The composition of the reserve cadre in Slovenia is very good. We also have good people in the territorial Army. [passage omitted]

[Mijic] Since all the defense plans are already being made on the assumption that Yugoslavia will disintegrate, who, in your opinion, represents the greatest danger to Yugoslavia's integrity?

[Jansa] The greatest danger for the Yugoslavia's integrity are those forces which do not accept changes in society, but use repressive force to retain the monopoly of power at any cost and cite the constitutional provisions that have already become obsolete. [passage omitted]

[Mijic] How do you envisage the Slovene Army, and how big will it be?

[Jansa] Demos' view on how to find a solution to Slovenia's military question is based on the assessment of what could happen, and therefore mentioning numbers would not imply any plans, but possibilities resulting from comparisons of similar situations in other European countries. These are only plans, which could be put into practice. In case of a confederal system, however, the plans could be changed. Of course, certain branches of the Army, such as the Air Force and the Navy, would be under joint control at the confederal level while the land forces would have to be in the republics' spheres of competence, with confederal coordination and joint command.

[Mijic] In Croatia there is a new multiparty assembly. The Croatian Democratic Community has the majority. It has a program similar to that of Demos. If democracy and multiparty elections fail in other republics in Yugoslavia, and Slovenia and Croatia secede, how do you see the joint defense of these two republics?

[Jansa] A union in the joint defense of Slovenia and Croatia is a real possibility. [passage omitted]

[Mijic] How do you see the resistance of certain sections in the Yugoslav People's Army to a multiparty system in Yugoslavia and the future of the Yugoslav People's Army if Yugoslavia disintegrates?

[Jansa] It is true that a section of the military structure in the Yugoslav People's Army is resisting a multiparty system, but not the Yugoslav People's Army as a whole, because if this were the case, then this would imply a clash with the people of Slovenia and Croatia. The Army as a political factor should be deprived of this attribute and be made a defense mechanism as it is in all other democratic countries. [passage omitted]

[Mijic] In case Slovenia was attacked from outside, would you call the Yugoslav People's Army for help?

[Jansa] This is its constitutional obligation. [passage omitted]

Slovenia Radio, TV Assembly on New Statute

LD2905082190 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1745 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Ljubljana, 28 May (TANJUG)—The transformation of Slovenia Radio and TV into a public, nonprofit braodcasting organization will, in all likelihood, be carried out by July of this year. This was stated at the 28 May regular assembly of Slovenia Radio and TV, which considered a new statute and platform of Slovenia Radio and TV in connection with the Yugoslav Radio and TV reorganization.

It was said today that the statute is short and concise, and that Article 39 is of a special importance. This article envisions that the assembly, if it secures a two-thirds majority of all delegates of Slovenia Radio and TV, appoints and dismisses its director. The post of the Slovenia Radio and TV director will be advertised externally. Objections were made about Slovenia TV's attitude toward new television enterprises to be set up in this republic.

Some assembly members believe that the statute does not define clearly when profit-making is allowed and when not. Other objections to the status and its addendum were mainly linguistic and formal. It was said today that on 26 June employees of Slovenia Radio and TV will decide in a referendum whether to accept the statute.

Members of the Slovenia Radio and TV assembly believe that radio and television centers can independently become members of some international broadcasting organizations. They also hold that the existing Yugoslav Radio and TV organization is impossible to "improve." Instead, a completely new one should be developed. This new organization should be a nonpolitical association, and at the same time a business community meeting the interests of its founders.

BORBA Article Assesses Presidency, FEC

AU1106121490 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 2-3 Jun 90 p 1

[Slavko Curuvija article: "Interference on the Federal Line"]

[Text] Undoubtedly it was very exciting to follow the stormy reaction (from the public) last week and (in the SFRY Assembly) this week, first to the "warning" inaugural speech by Borisav Jovic, and then to the speech by the president of the SFRY Presidency on behalf of that Presidency. The most interesting response to these speeches, a response that certainly cannot be ignored from the point of view of political analyses and prognoses, has come from another high federal official, Zivko Pregl, vice president of Federal Executive Council [FEC]. Pregl said in Ljubljana DELO that Jovic's speech simply did not leave any room for the government to maneuver for the implementation of the reform...!

The entire affair, of course with some goodwill, could perhaps be stretched to some sort of interpretation that would explain the dispute as a fruit of different approaches by the two politicians to some important matters. However, the last opportunity to reduce the obvious flying of sparks to the (lower) level of personal relations and views of Borisav Jovic and Zivko Pregl has been eliminated by the fact that the SFRY Presidency appeared before the SFRY Assembly on Monday with theses stressing precisely the serious undermining of the constitutional order in the country as the main issue (which is to say precisely as in Jovic's inaugural speech), and by the fact that the FEC—only two days earlier—issued a statement which unequivocally stressed reform as the main issue (which is to say like Pregl in his reaction to Jovic's inaugural speech).

This evident interference on the line between the SFRY Presidency and the FEC could thus be both the introduction to and the cover for the variations of all those delicate questions and rumors that have been circulating in the public from the moment when Jovic in his (resolute) style announced to the Yugoslav peoples and nationalities what he said at the moment when he took over the baton from Janez Drnovsek. Especially the questions: Has Drnovsek intentionally kept the information, on the basis of which Jovic made his first speech, in his drawer and ignored it? Did Premier Markovic and the FEC see the report prepared by the people in charge of the country's security (which is to say, their ministers) at all in advance, and if they did see it, did they reject it as irrelevant and not inform the public about it? Have the relations between, say, the defense minister and premier somewhat cooled off because of all this? Is the "hard core" element within the SFRY Presidency preparing some unpleasant surprise to the young, swinging, and it seems somewhat unruly democracy in the country's northwest? Is the SFRY Presidency searching for some sort of state reason to discipline the overambitious political radicals? What was supposed to be shown by the impressive picture from the Assembly benches in which the premier sat flanked by the Army minister on his right and the police minister on his left, while all the other ministers sat "somewhere at the back?"

However, regardless of the fact that even an improvised discussion of these questions (and it cannot be anything else but improvised, because one cannot obtain any solid information on all this) would most certainly provide entertainment for the public, the only serious dilemma worthy of attention which may be and perhaps must be discussed in connection with the sparks flying between Jovic and Pregl, or the SFRY Presidency and the Federal Executive Council, is the following: Must the two extremely significant and prestigious federal organs dissipate their (reform) forces in public and secret disputes between themselves, if they follow, as they say, the same reform task and if they equally desire to pull Yugoslavia out of the present humiliating crisis? Particularly because in such a dispute, Jovic will always and at once be attacked by the entire northwest part of the country and defended by the southeast, as he was last week, and Markovic will be attacked by the entire southeast and defended by the northeast.

The desired answer should of course read that they must not. There are, however, some matters that warn that this tension could nevertheless continue and even increase, although, for instance, Zivko Pregl in the interview stated that it was "too early to speak about a definitive conflict" and that it was "rather a nervous reaction, which is one of the last vestiges of the old way of thinking." One of these matters —in fact, it could be the key one—is the difference in the constitutional and actual position of the two organs. The SFRY Presidency is ultimately the factor of stability, and the FEC, especially the current one under Markovic, is a factor of "instability." More precisely: It is a factor of changes

that must of course first obtain some room by destroying the previous reign of the old norms. Regarding the constitutional field alone, which is to say a field that obviously seems very essential to the SFRY Presidency, this destruction of the reign of old norms has created an "unconstitutional situation" in many fields. Some people call this "putting the Constitution in jeopardy" and others "a creative reading of the Constitution."

In addition, in order to push through the reform—and this is its chief and certainly decisive aim—the FEC must be very pragmatic, must respect political and other realities to the maximum, and it must simply deal in a minutely sensitive way with all the old as well as new factors, and in the last resort sometimes haggle with them. Precisely this: to overlook, to keep quiet, or to push back into a second or third place something so that one can profit in some other thing. The SFRY Presidency, however, does not conduct such sensitive (daily) politics. Thanks to its constitutional position, it may perhaps permit itself the luxury of judging after the events and of being the serious guardian of internal and external borders, achievements, and various other sacred things....

Finally, there are significant overlaps in the constitutional powers of the two federal organs that have not been eliminated. One of the examples is precisely the security of the state and the protection of the constitutional system. The SFRY Presidency as the obvious constitutional successor to late President Tito is the supreme commander of the Yugoslav Armed Forces, but the Army minister and his department are in the FEC! During the times of the past pallid federal governments and their premiers who looked for, and obtained, all their important decisions in the SFRY Presidency and the Presidium of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia Central Committee, it did not even occur to the Army or the police ministers to attend government sessions. They sent there their deputies and assistants, and they themselves attended the SFRY Presidency sessions. As far as it is known, Markovic likes to see both ministers at the FEC sessions, and it seems that they in turn respect this wish.

This is not all. Markovic's FEC on several occasions publicly and fairly clearly made it known—and it offered this in a quite specific form in the proposed constitutional amendments—that it wants to be a true federal government, with all the powers known in parliamentary systems. The Presidency members, subjectively, cannot really like this, because it inevitably takes away some of their powers and pushes them to the more or less protocol and honorary position of some Western presidents.

Anyhow, even the increasingly frequent public celebration of Ante Markovic as the person with most, if not exclusive, credit for the present reform steps could cause various, quite human, reactions among some SFRY Presidency members, particularly since the entire Presidency has fully backed Ante Markovic on sensitive reform matters and always at the right time.

Should one get specially excited because of such and similar sparks flying? It seems one should not. Neither are the disputes so big as to endanger the reform, nor is it unusual that such things should happen in an obviously transitional period, with the transition from various monopolies to democracy of the multiparty type.

Serbian SAWP President on Elections

AU1006142490 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 1 Jun 90 p 4

[S. Jankovic report: "Multiparty Elections Toward the End of the Year"]

[Text] Kragujevac—In the current debate over the transformation of the Socialist Alliance into an independent organization, which would be either a party or an alliance, depending on what the majority of citizens decide, the most frequently raised question is the question concerning relations with the League of Communists of Serbia-Party for Democratic Socialism. In the new multiparty system there will be no place for any kind of paternalism, because we will have completely independent organizations which will, because of the similarities in their programs, be able to cooperate with each other. The fact that we have been regarded as the transmission belt of the League of Communists was a result of the system, but we were not the only ones in the Socialist Alliance of the Working People to be a transmission belt of a particular party, said Radmila Andjelkovic, president of the Republican Conference of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Serbia, at the session of the Kragujevac Communal Conference yesterday at which the members adopted the program of the discussion on the transformation of this front organization. Connected with this is also a question of dual and collective membership. This will be possible, Andjelkovic continued, and is not an original idea at all, because it exists in other developed parliamentary democracies. In brief, the organization would not have reasons to prohibit its members from being members of other parties, just as it will not hinder members of other parties from becoming members of our organization. All the present, collective members of the Socialist Alliance of Working People will have to decide themselves whether to stay or leave the Socialist Alliance.

New multiparty democratic elections in Serbia will be possible once constitutional and legal conditions have been created. There is no reason to rush them and disregard the Constitution and laws, but I believe that they will be held toward the end of the year, or at the beginning of next year, Radmila Andjelkovic said.

The present generation of the League of Communists of Serbia is not responsible for what had happened before 1987 and the Eighth Session of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Serbia, because we did not take part in what had happened before. We are only responsible for what has happened, as stated here, since the new Serbia started to evolve. The draft of the new

Serbian Constitution will soon be published and will reflect the will of the people. Up to now we have never been able to draft it independently. As we know, the new Constitution will be free of all ideological bias, Radmila Andjelkovic said in conclusion.

SDS Chairman Raskovic Addresses Rally

LD1006170190 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1058 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Vukovar [Croatia], 10 Jun (TANJUG)—Serbian Democratic Party [SDS] Chairman Dr. Jovan Raskovic addressed 4,000 to 5,000 people from Vukovar and surrounding villages at the founding assembly of the local committee of the Vukovar SDS, held today [10 June] in the Atica picnic area.

Having observed that he does not wish to be the leader but the servant and subject of the Serbian people, to whom you too belong, Dr. Raskovic said that the SDS is the only real refuge and protector of the Serbian people in Croatia and that it therefore resolutely advocates the full equality of Serbs and a Yugoslavia on federal principles. [passage omitted on the electoral victory of the Croatian Democratic Community in Croatia as a reality but that the freedoms of individual citizens must be respected in Croatia]

Serbs in Croatia request the full right to their language, their publishing activity, and newspapers, and we will also set up our television, Dr. Raskovic said.

Interrupted in stormy fashion on several occasions, Dr. Raskovic also spoke of his talks with Warren Zimmerman, the U.S. Ambassador in Belgrade, and he noted that the ambassador understands us better than some new ambassadors here in Croatia, and went on to say that he would continue to have talks with foreign factors so as to acquaint them with the life and problems of Serbs in Croatia.

The meeting was organized in an exemplary way, and there was no reaction from those present to the occasional and individual shouts which were heard, for example, we will kill Tudjman.

Serbian Opposition Plans Protest Rally 13 Jun

LD1106154990 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1345 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Belgrade, 11 Jun (TANJUG)—Serbian opposition parties will hold a protest meeting on Belgrade's Republic Square on Wednesday [13 June] at 1400 [1200 GMT] at which the representatives of all unregistered parties and political factions will request urgent multiparty elections and new laws on elections, political organizations, and the public media. This was stressed today at a news conference organized by the National Radical Party [Narodna Radikalna Stranka], the Democratic Party, the Serbian Renaissance Movement [Srpski Pokret Obnove-SPO], the Social Democratic Party of Yugoslavia, and the Liberal Party (Valjevo).

Dr. Dragoljub Micunovic said that at the protest meeting representatives of all opposition parties will speak, that there will be no unregistered speeches, and that after the meeting on Republic Square, a protest note and the demands of the parties will be handed to the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Serbia. About 100,000 citizens from Belgrade and other parts of Serbia are expected to participate, Micunovic said, observing that similar meetings will also be organized in other parts of the Republic if the meeting on Republic Square has public support. "There will, sir, not only be a protest meeting in Belgrade and not only one," said Vuk Draskovic, leader of the SPO, promising that "in Serbia it is only now that the people—and not the people who were organized by the authorites—will make their feelings known."

Most of the conference consisted of bitter speeches made by leaders of the parties focusing on Saturday's "failed" negotiations between the five party leaders and Zoran Sokolovic, president of the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Serbia. "Negotiations are now at a standstill," Micunovic said, who explained how the nine hours of talks with the leader of the Serbian parliament proceeded. He admitted that in these talks there was no pressure on the organizers of the protest meeting to refrain from holding the demonstrations, while Veljko Guberina (NRS) intimated that "the talks with the authorities would begin on 13 June." The protest meeting is otherwise in order and has been reported to the Secretariat for Internal Affairs. The opposition parties are not expecting it to be banned, all the more so as these convictions were acquired by the opposition leaders in the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Serbia on the occasion of the talks with high-ranking officials of the republic.

The opposition criticizes the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Serbia for the fact that in the meeting with it, on three occasions it issued a statement without referring to the names of the party leaders who participated in the talks; and nine opposition parties, whose representatives did not attend these talks, also severely reproached the opposition negotiators and the Assembly because they were not invited to negotiate. Dr. Dragoljub Micunovic stressed that only five parties had the initiative to undertake talks with the authorities, but that the protest on Republic Square is open to all opposition parties. [passage omitted]

Serbian SAWP on Protest Rally

AU1206123190 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] At a time when Serbia is uniting itself, a meeting to promote discord is being organized. This is a negation of the constitutional system and the law-governed state. This was stressed in a statement issued by the Presidium of the Republican Conference of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Serbia.

At its session held today, the Presidium sharply criticized the intention of certain opposition parties to call for

multiparty elections at the meeting scheduled to take place in Belgrade tomorrow [13 June]. Holding multiparty elections before a new Constitution is adopted, elections that are not in conformity with the Constitution, serve Albanian separatism, the statement points out.

Serbia Takes Over Kosovo Militia

LD1106172890 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1652 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Belgrade, 11 Jun (TANJUG)—Attempts to operate parallel internal affairs organs in Kosovo have seriously jeopardized peace and public order in this province. In this connection, the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Serbia has issued the following statement:

The Presidency has stated, among other things, that the method of organizing and implementing certain functions by the Kosovo Provincial Secretariat for Internal Affairs, and especially the method of employing a number of members of the provincial militia with attempts to operate parallel internal affairs organs in the province, has seriously jeopardized public order and peace in the province. As a result of this, and starting from its constitutional responsibility for public order and peace in the republic, the presidency of the Serbian Socialist Republic has decided that all the functions of the militia serving internal affairs in the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo are to be united and taken over by the republican Secretariat for Internal Affairs of the Serbian Socalist Republic.

This decision has come into force, it says at the end of the statement.

Bosnia's Durakovic on Serbian LC, SAWP Plans

AU1106142090 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Ljubomir Nikolic report]

[Text] Following the announcement that the Serbian League of Communists and the Socialist Alliance of Working People intend to merge, Nijaz Durakovic, president of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Bosnia-Hercegovina said that this is bringing into question the announced congress of renewal of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Here is a report by Ljubomir Nikolic: [Begin Nikolic recording] News of the amalgamation of the Serbian League of Communists and the Socialist Alliance of Working People was received with surprise by the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Nijaz Durakovic, president of the Central Committee, told us today that the move by the Serbian communists is bringing into question the announced congress of renewal of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, because a big part of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in fact no long exists. The leadership of the League of Communists of Serbia has gone further than the leaderships of the Slovene and Croatian communists who at least retain communists traits in their names, Durakovic said.

The possibile amalgamation of the communists and the socialists is not mentioned in Bosnia-Hercegovina as of yet. Both parties, the League of Communists and the Socialist Alliance of Working People, are presenting their programs separately, conducting actions concerning the organization of their membership, and preparing for elections.

However, in the public, especially in its left-oriented wing, there is a belief that this is a waste of strength and funds, and that the founding of a left-wing bloc would be more useful, because the communists' chances in the upcoming multiparty elections in November are tied to the outcome of the congress of renewal of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Some members of the Republican Central Committee say that they are ready for a coalition with the Socialist Alliance and all democratic forces in the republic to prevent incidents, interethnic confrontations, and clashes. This is in fact which the people in Bosnia-Hercegovina most fear. [end recording]

Nine Parties Apply To Register in Bosnia

LD1006140890 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0901 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Sarajevo, 10 June (TANJUG)—The only political party we have registered thus far is the Bosnia-Hercegovina League of Communists, Sarajevo high court judge Suljo Babic said in his statement to OSLOBODJENJE. He said that at the moment there are nine political parties applying for registration in the Sarajevo court.

Applications have been submitted by the Workers Democratic Party [Radnicka Demokratska Stranka]; the Yugoslav Association of Citizens [Jugoslovensko Udruzenje Gradjana] (their applications will be rejected because their documents, to which their attention was drawn, have not been modified within the legally stipulated term); the National People's Party [Nacionalna Narodna Stranka], the Association for Yugoslav Democratic Initiative-Sarajevo branch [Udruzenje za Jugoslovensku Demokratsku Inicijativu]—its documentation is also incomplete—the Islamic Democratic Unity for Controlling the Work and Finances of the Islamic Community of Yugoslavia (registering this kind of association is totally beyond the court's competence); the Party of Democratic Action [Stranka Demokratska Akcije]; the United Yugoslav Movement [Jedinstveni Jugoslovenski Pokret]; the "Bosna" People's Party [Narodna Stranka Bosna]; and the "Gajret" Democratic Economic Party [Demokratska Privredna Stranka "Gajret"].

Bosnian Muslim Leader on SDA Party Formation

AU1206103690 Zagreb VECERNJI LIST in Serbo-Croatian 3 Jun 90 pp 6,7

[Report on interview with Democratic Action Party leader Alija Izetbegovic by Azra Kaurin; place and date not given: "We Are Convincingly Number One"]

[Excerpts] The increasingly hot political scene in Bosnia-Hercegovina was enriched last weekend with the appearance of the first single nationality party. Despite the legal ban on the organization and association of citizens on the national and religious basis in the Bosnia-Hercegovina, the Democratic Action Party [Stranka demokratske inicijative—SDA] was founded in the presence of more than 1,500 supporters. The initiators wanted to found a Yugoslav Muslim Party, but because of the existing laws, the party was given a different name.

The SDA is a political alliance of citizens in Yugoslavia who belong to the Muslim cultural-historic circle, as well as of all other citizens who accept its program. The basic aims of the party are: the affirmation of human rights, democracy, a market economy, the equality of the peoples of Yugoslavia, the affirmation of the national identity of Muslims living in Bosnia-Hercegovina, the autonomy and free activity of all religious communities, and the preservation of the integrity and inviolability of the borders of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Yugoslavia. [passage omitted]

[Kaurin] Your founding assembly was attended by the representatives of 73 places in Bosnia-Hercegovina and Yugoslavia.

[Izetbegovic] Unless some artificially created obstacles appear, we will soon have 70 initiative councils registered on the territory of Bosnia-Hercegovina. We already have, although still unregistered, a large number of initiative councils in Mostar, Banja Luka, Tesanj, Zenica, Velika Kladusa, Kladanj.... There is also a big initiative council in Zagreb where we think we will have more than 10,000 supporters. As far as Bosnia-Hercegovina is concerned, I can categorically state that we are the biggest party. Our initial calculations show that we will have people registering their membership with the party at the rate of about 100,000 a month.

According to our calculations, by election time, we could have about 400,000 registered members, which means twice as many votes. No one can win in Bosnia-Hercegovina. One can only have a relative majority. We think that we will be the biggest party, but that we will not attract more than 35 percent of the electorate. Even so, this would be a success for us. Other parties will be weaker. [passage omitted]

[Kaurin] What plans does your party has concerning the public information media? There are rumors that the party will first carry out some changes in Sarajevo Television.

[Izetbegovic] The commentary by Mladen Paunovic on Sarajevo Television led us to the conclusion that Sarajevo Television considers itself invited to act against our party. We are talking about a commentary which falsely presented our founding assembly. The journalist Mladen Paunovic was not present at the founding assembly, but could have been, since the doors were opened to everybody. I can openly say that the commentary was made according to Goebels' recipe. The television audience was presented with completely wrong information. [passage omitted]

[Kaurin] Why were representatives of Serbian parties not present at the founding assembly of the Democratic Action Party?

[Izetbegovic] There were some, but they did not inform us about their presence before the beginning of the assembly. [passage omitted]

[Kaurin] How do you see Bosnia-Hercegovina in the future?

[Izetbegovic] Bosnia has lasted 1000 years. I do not see any reason for it to break up now. Bosnia is impossible to divide because it is such a mixture of nationalities, just like the apartment bloc where I live. A house shared by Serbs, Croats, and Muslims is impossible to divide, so is Bosnia. [passage omitted]

[Kaurin] What can you say about cooperation with Croatian Democratic Community President Franjo Tudjman?

[Izetbegovic] I know Mr. Tudjman personally and respect him. From our talks, I felt that he is a man of his word, which is very important to our party, and that one can talk to him openly about anything. When I said that he is a Croatian nationalist, one must not forget that one can be a nationalist in the positive sense. Perhaps his course is a little bit too Croatia-oriented for our taste, but he has the right to be that way, to fight for his people. He is probably a very hard negotiator. We have not held more extensive talks with Mr. Tudjman yet. I generally think that the Croatian Democratic Community does not intent to undermine Bosnia.

[Kaurin] Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic plans to found his own party. What are your predictions concerning this party?

[Izetbegovic] It is a bit unusual for the president of a government to found his own party. Perhaps he will have a certain number of supporters among those who regard themselves as Yugoslavs. I do not think that he has significant chances in Slovenia, Croatia, or parts of Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Croatian Socialist Party Appoints Team to SAWP

LD0906194990 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1641 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Zagreb, 8 Jun (TANJUG)—In considering its own interests, the Socialist Party of Croatia [Socijalisticka Stranka Hrvatske] wishes to have liaison with other socialist parties in Yugoslavia. At its session today the head council of the Croatian Socialist Party decided to appoint a four-member delegation with the status of observers to the SAWP [Socialist Alliance of Working People] federal conference, which will actively take part in the already initiated processes of creating a new Socialist Party of Yugoslavia.

Finally, it is announced that the delegation of the republican conference of the SAWP, the League of Socialists, can no longer represent the Socialist Party of Croatia in the SAWPY Federal Conference.